UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
3 1761 01968588 2

James Sheridan Esq.

MANUAL

OF

UNIVERSAL CHURCH HISTORY.

VOL. III.

SECOND AND THIRD PERIODS

(A.D. 1303-1648).

MANUAL

OF

UNIVERSAL CHURCH HISTORY.

BY THE

REV. JOHN ALZOG, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG.

TRANSLATED, WITH ADDITIONS, FROM THE NINTH AND LAST GERMAN EDITION,

BY THE

REV. F. J. PABISCH,

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY AND OF CANON AND CIVIL LAW, PRESIDENT OF THE PROVINCIAL SEMINARY OF MOUNT ST. MARY'S OF THE WEST, CINCINNATI, OHIO;

AND THE

REV. THOMAS S. BYRNE,

PROFESSOR AT MOUNT ST. MARY'S SEMINARY.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

WITH CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES AND ECCLESIASTICO-GEOGRAPHICAL MAPS.

VOL III.

New Edition.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

DUBLIN

M. H. GILL AND SON, O'CONNELL STREET

1890

Cincinnati, August 15th, 1874.

With no ordinary satisfaction we attach our "Imprimatur" to this most necessary Manual of Ecclesiastical History of the Rev. Dr. Alzog. The work, as it comes from the hands of the Rev. President and a Rev. Professor of our Seminary, may be considered an improvement on the original. It is better adapted to our needs, and from the favour with which the prospectus has been received by our Most Reverend and Right Reverend Prelates and Professors of Theology, we have no doubt of its being regarded as a valuable acquisition to ecclesiastical science.

✠ *J. B. PURCELL,*
Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Baltimore, August 28th, 1874.

Dr. Alzog's Manual of Church History is by far the best compendium of Church History within my knowledge, and is specially fitted to be a text-book on the subject in Colleges and Seminaries. It is no mere compilation, as such books generally are, but a fresh and original history, such as could have been written only by a man of the most extensive and accurate learning. . . . I have looked over the proof-sheets you forwarded to me, and am convinced that this most excellent Manual has been much improved by your labours. It has been admirably "done into English," and its value as a text-book and guide in this most useful but much neglected branch of study is greatly increased by your brief notes, additional documents, &c. With sincere respect,

Very truly yours in Christ,

✠ *J. ROOSEVELT BAYLEY,*
Archbishop of Baltimore.

SYNOPTICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

OF THE THIRD VOLUME.

SECOND PERIOD.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH PREDOMINANT AMONG THE GERMANIC AND SLAVIC NATIONS—SHE CONVERTS THEM TO CHRISTIANITY, AND CIVILIZES THEM—HER HISTORY TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

SECOND EPOCH.

PART SECOND.

From the Death of Boniface VIII. to the Western Schism (A. D. 1303-1517)—*Decline of Mediæval Papal Supremacy—Transition to its Condition in Modern Times—Reformatory Councils.*

PAGE

§ 265. Literature—Character of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries ... 1

CHAPTER I. *Constitution of the Church as regards her Exterior Development.*

A.—The Popes of Avignon, or the Babylonian Captivity (1309-1378).

§§ 266. Translation of the Holy See to Avignon—Benedict XI.—Clement V. ... 3
Fifteenth Œcumenical Council 8
267. John XXII.—Benedict XII.—Clement VI.—Struggle with Louis the Bavarian 11
268. Innocent VI.—Bl. Urban V.—Gregory XI. 17

B.—Great Western Schism (A. D. 1378-1417 and 1439-1449)—*Popes at Rome and at Avignon—Reformatory Synods of Pisa, Constance, and Basle.*

§ 269. Urban VI.—Boniface IX.—Innocent VII.—Gregory XII. 22
270. Council of Pisa (1409)—Alexander V.—John XXIII. 28
271. The Council of Constance (1414-1418) 32
272. Eugene IV.—Nicholas V.—The Council of Basle; its Protest against being transferred to Ferrara and Florence—Emperor Sigismund—Albert II.—Frederic III. 43

C.—The Last Popes of this Period—Fifth Council of Lateran.

§ 273. Calixtus III.—Pius II.—Paul II.—Sixtus IV.—Innocent VIII.—Alexander VI. 59
274. Julius II.—Synod of Pisa—Fifth Council of Lateran—Leo X. ... 72
275. Review of the Situation of the Papacy 78
276. Review of the Condition of the other Members of the Hierarchy ... 81
277. Morals of the Clergy 82
278. Negotiations with the Greek Church for a Restoration of Union—Seventeenth Œcumenical Council at Ferrara and Florence 84

CHAPTER II. *Heresies and Heretical Sects.*

PAGE

§ 279. John Wickliffe (A. D. 1324-1384) 95
280. John Huss (1373-1415)—The Hussites 99
The Hussite Wars 110
281. German Theology 113
282. The Heretics, John Wesel, and John van Goch, and the Zealots, John Wessel, and Jerome Savonarola 114
283. The Inquisition 118

CHAPTER III. *Ecclesiastical Science.*

§ 284. Scholasticism during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries 124
285. Mysticism—The Friends of God 128
286. The so-called Revival of Learning by the Humanists 133
287. The Study of Holy Scriptures—Spread of the Bible among the People ... 138

CHAPTER IV. *Spiritual Life—Worship—Penitential Discipline.*

§ 288. Spiritual Life 143
289. History of the Older Religious Orders 146
290. Reform of the Older Orders 148
291. New Orders 149
292. Independent Associations 151
293. Worship during this Epoch 151
294. Christian Art 160
295. Penitential Discipline 173
296. Propagation of Christianity and Conversion of the Jews 174
297. Retrospect of the Influence exercised by the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages 178

THIRD PERIOD.

FROM THE WESTERN SCHISM BY LUTHER DOWN TO OUR OWN TIMES (1517-1878).

FIRST EPOCH.

From the Rise of Protestantism to the Treaty of Westphalia (1517-1648).

§ 298. Sources—Works by Protestants and Catholics—*General Character of this Period* 181

CHAPTER I. *Religious Movements in Germany and Switzerland.*

§ 299. Luther's Manifest against Indulgences—His First Adversaries 184
300. Negotiation between Rome and Luther—Disputation at Leipsig—*Eck*, *Emser*, *Carlstadt*, and *Melanchthon* 193
301. Affinity of Luther's Religious System to the Code of the Robber Knights and the Principles of Paganism 199
302. Luther's Condemnation—Publication of the Bull of Excommunication ... 205
303. The Diet of Worms, 1521—Luther at Wartburg 206
304. Death of Leo X.—His Character 211
305. The Diet of Nürnberg, 1522 211
306. Efforts of Melanchthon and Luther to spread the New Teachings ... 213
307. The Diet of Nürnberg, 1524 215
308. Disorders at Wittenberg, caused by Carlstadt—The Anabaptists and the Peasants' War 217

PAGE

§ 309. Henry VIII., King of England, and Erasmus oppose Luther—Marriage of Luther 223
310. Organization of the Lutheran Church in Hesse and Saxony 228
311. Diets of Spire (1526, 1529) 230
312. Diet of Augsburg, 1530—Augsburg Confession—Catholic Refutation—Recess of the Diet 233
313. *Zwingli and Œcolampadius* 242
314. Zwingli's System 250
315. The Sacramentarian Controversy 252
316. *Progress of Protestantism in Germany* until the Interim of Ratisbon (1541) 257
317. The Anabaptists at Münster—Bigamy of the Landgrave, Philip of Hesse 262
318. Fresh Acts of Violence by Protestants—Renewed Attempts to adjust Religious Difficulties 266
319. Death of Luther—His Public Character 270
220. The Schmalkaldic War—Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555)– Resignation and Death of Charles V. 275
321. *Calvin and his Reform at Geneva—Beza* 282
322. Calvin's System 287

CHAPTER II. *Propagation of Protestantism in Europe.*

§ 323. Protestantism in Prussia 290
324. ,, Silesia 292
325. ,, Poland 296
326. ,, Livonia, Courland, Esthonia, Hungary, and Transylvania 301
327. ,, Sweden 304
328. ,, Denmark, Norway, and Iceland 313
329. ,, England 315
330. ,, Scotland 342
331. ,, Ireland 347
332. ,, France 371
333. ,, the Netherlands 382
334. General Causes of the Rapid Spread of Protestantism 387

CHAPTER III. *Continuation of the History of Protestantism—Its Internal Dissensions.*

§ 335. General Characteristics of Protestantism 392
336. The Protestant Clergy—Their Rights—Their Relations to the State—*Episcopal*, *Territorial*, and *Collegiate System* 394
337. Worship and Discipline 397
338. Protestant Exegetics 400
339. Mystics and Visionaries 402
340. Controversies within the Reformed and Lutheran Churches 404
341. Sects among the Protestants 415

CHAPTER IV. *History of the Catholic Church.*

§ 342. Summary 420
343. *The Œcumenical Council of Trent* 421
344. Other Popes of this Epoch 436
345*a*. The Papacy 442
345*b*. The Secular and Regular Clergy—Revival of Synods 443
346. The Order of Jesuits 445
347. Labours of the Jesuits 451
348. The other Orders 454
349. Foreign Missions 465
350. Theological Science in the Catholic Church 472
351. New Controversies on Grace—*Baius*, *Molina*, *Jansenius* 482

PAGE
§ 352. Art still in the Service of the Church 487
353. Religious Life 491

CHAPTER V. *Relation of Catholics to Protestants.*

§ 354. Attempts at Reconciliation 494
355. The Thirty Years' War 498
356. The Peace of Westphalia 504

CHAPTER VI. *The Greek Church.*

§ 357. The Greek Church under the Turks 507
358. Relations of the Greek Church to the Lutheran, Calvinist, and Catholic Churches 509
359. The Græco-Russian Church under its own Patriarchs 513
360. The Monophysites and Nestorians 515

SECOND EPOCH.

PART SECOND.

FROM THE DEATH OF BONIFACE VIII. TO THE WESTERN SCHISM (A.D. 1303–1517).

DECLINE OF MEDIÆVAL PAPAL SUPREMACY—TRANSITION TO ITS CONDITION IN MODERN TIMES—REFORMATORY COUNCILS.

§ 265. *Literature—Character of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.*

Sources:—Cf. *Lorenz*, Germany's Sources of History in the Middle Ages, from the middle of the thirteenth to the end of the fourteenth century, Berlin, 1870. *Ptolem. de Fiadon*, H. e. to 1316. *Albertus Argentinensis*, Chron. 1273-1348. (*Urstis.*, T. II., p. 95 sq.) *Barth. Ferrariensis*, O. P., Polyhistoria, 1287-1367. (*Muratori*, Scriptt., T. XXIV.) *Albertinus Mussatus*, poet laureate and statesman of Padua († 1330), Hist. Augusta Henrici VII., libb. XVI.; de gestis Italicor. post mortem Henr. VII., libb. VIII. to 1317, Ludovicus Bavarus, incomplete (*Muratori*, Scriptor., T. X., and *Grævii* et *Burmanni*, Thesaur. Italiæ, T. VI., P. II.) *Giovanni Villani*, Statesman of Florence († 1364), Storie Fiorentine to 1348, continued by Matteo and Filippo Villani to 1364 (*Muratori*, T. XIII. sq.), Mil., 1729 f. *Jean Froissart* of Valenciennes († 1401), Chron. de France, d'Angl., etc., 1326-1400; Par., 1503 sq., 4 T. f.; revue par *Sauvage*, Lyon, 1599 sq., 4 T. In the Collec. des chroniques par *Buchon*, Par., 1824, 10-25 T. of the thirteenth century. (*Prætorius*, on Froissart, in Schlosser's Historical Archives, Vol. V., p. 213, 1833.) *Joannes* de *Winterthur*, seu *Vitoduranus*, O. S. F., Chron. 1215-1348. (*Eccard.*, T. I., better in the Thesaur. Hist. Helveticæ. Tiguri, 1735 fol.) Böhmer, Fontes rer. Germanic., T. IV. Henricus de Dissenhofen and other sources of German hist., ed. *A. Huber*, Stuttg., 1868. *The Chronicles of German Cities*, from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, ed. under the superintendence of *Hegel*, Lps., 1860-70, 9 vols. (of Nürnberg, Vol. I.-III.; of Augsburg, Vols. IV. and V.; of Brunswick and Magdeburg, Vols. VI and VII.; of Strasburg, Chronicle by *Closener* and *Jacob Twinger of Königshofen*, Vols VIII. and IX.; also in *Mone's* Collection of the History of Baden, Vol. III.) *Zimmer's* Chronicle, published by *Barack*, Stuttg., 1869, 4 vols. (Library of the Literary Society of Stuttg., Vols. 91-94.) *Gobelinus Persona*, Dean of Bielefeld († 1420). Cosmodromium

original, from 1340-1418. (*Meibom.*, T. I., p. 53). **Antonini*, Archiepisc. Florent., Summa historialis († 1459) to 1459; Norimb., 1484, 3 T. f. and oftener; also Opp., Flor., 1741 sq., T. I. *Pii* II., Commentarii rer. memorabil. a Joan. Gobelino compositi 1405-65; Fref., 1614 f. *Werner Rolevink*, Carthusian of Cologne († 1500), Fasciculus temporum to 1476, Colon., 1474 f., continued by *Linturius* to 1514 (*Pistorius Struve*, T. II., p. 347 sq.) *Coccius Sabellicus*, Historian of Venice († 1506), Enneades s. rhapsodia historiarum to 1504, Venet., 1498 sq., 2 T. f. (Opp., Basil., 1560, 4 T. f.) *Joan. Trithemii* († 1516, Abbot of St. James's, near Würzburg), Ann. Hirsaugienses., 830-1514, St. Galli, 1690, 2 T. f.; see Vol. I., p. 30.—*Phil. de Commines* († 1509), Chron. et histoire 1464-98, Par., 1523 f. and oftener, revised by L. du *Fresnoy*, Lond., 1747, 4 T. 4to; par *Dupont*, Par., 1840 sq., 3 T. *Fr. Guicciardini*, Statesman of Florence and Rome († 1540), Storia d'Italia 1493-1532, Ven., 1567, 4to, and oftener. And for the church history of North Germany, the Metropolis of *Albert Cranz*. See Vol. I., pp. 30, 31.

During the pontificate of Boniface VIII., a tide in public opinion set in, which, extending over the whole face of society from prince to peasant, went on gathering strength through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Its characteristic was no longer the high ideal and spiritual tendency which aim at securing the best interests of mankind, but a tendency at once egotistic, materialistic, and degrading. Princes and people no longer regarded it as their highest duty to serve the Church and the general interests of Christendom; those who made sacrifices in a former age to secure the success of the Crusades, to found and endow charitable and religious institutions, and to build great monasteries and churches, found no imitators during these centuries. Princes professed to be engaged in patriotic projects for the honour and prosperity of their respective countries, and their subjects, following their example, were entirely given to the acquisition of wealth. The idea of a Holy Alliance between the Papacy and the Empire was but ill-understood, and was daily fading from men's minds.

These considerations, together with the many blemishes on the pontificate of Boniface VIII., will afford an explanation of the violent shock sustained in these centuries by the papal power, the effect of which was to weaken the political influence of the Holy See, and to thrust the Pope from the prominent position heretofore held by him in the councils of the Christian world. Such being now the condition of things, it became a matter of primary importance to determine precisely and to fix permanently the *normal* limits of papal power and authority, *as guaranteed by the very nature of the Primacy*. To solve the problem, *two* different and antagonistic methods were tried—*one* by the French gaolers of the Popes, and by the councils of Constance and Basle; the *other* by Pope Pius II. and his adherents, who, unable to read the signs of the times aright, attempted to regain the almost unlimited power of a bygone age.

Unfortunately, the incumbents of the papal chair, towards the close of this epoch, were either incapable or little desirous of re-establishing the Primacy on a solid and legitimate basis, and of restoring religious and social order, which had been so rudely shaken during the disastrous contest between the *papacy* and *episcopacy*.

These efforts to place the Primacy upon a *true* and *legitimate* basis; to place the Church, as it were, once more upon her feet; to give every opportunity to the development of her rich resources without either attacking or restricting the sacred rights and prerogative of the Pope; *to reform the Church in her Head and members*, occupy the interval of time between Boniface VIII. and Leo X.

CHAPTER I.

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH AS REGARDS HER EXTERIOR DEVELOPMENT.

Platina (Abbreviator of Pope Pius II., and, later on, Librarian of the Vatican, († 1481), Vitæ Pontiff. Romanor. (to Sixtus IV.), Venet., 1479, and oftener. Vitæ Paparum Avenionensium, ed. *Steph. Baluz.*, Par., 1693, 2 T. 4to. The lives of all the popes of these times are found in *Muratori*, Scriptt., T. III., P. I., II. *Theodorici de Niem*, Vitæ Pontiff. Romanor., 1288-1418, additis Imperatorum gestis (*Eccardi*, Corp. hist. med. ævi., T. I.) Documents in *Mansi*, *Harduin*, and *Raynaldi*, Continuatio annal. Baron. Among the special works, *Fleury*, Hist. ecclés. (nouv. éd. Par., 1840, augmentée de quatre livres comprenant l'histoire du 15 siècle d'après un manuscrit de Fleury appartenant à la bibl. royale, T. VI.) † *Palma*, Prælectiones, H. e. T. III., P. II., and T. IV. * *Hefele*, A glance at the fifteenth century and its reformatory councils, especially that of Basle (in the Annals of Christian Theology and Philosophy, published at *Giessen*, Vol. IV., nro. 1.) The *same*, Hist. of Councils, Vols. VI. and VII., Pt. I. *Muratori*, Hist. of Italy. Germ. transl., Vols. VIII. and IX. † *Damberger*, Synchronistic History, Vols. XII.-XV. (to 1378). *Cantù*, Vol. VIII. (Book 13). *Schlosser-Kriegk*, Vols. VIII. and IX. *Dönniges*, History of the German Empire during the fourteenth century, Berlin, 1840 sq., 2 div. *Lorenz*, History of Germany during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Vienna, 1863-1866, 2 vols.

THE POPES OF AVIGNON OR THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY (1309-1378).

Histoire des souverains Pontifes qui ont siégé à Avignon, Avignon, 1777, 4to. *† *Christophe*, Histoire de la papauté au xiv. siècle, Paris, 1853; Germ. by *Ritter*, Paderborn, 1853, 2 vols. History of Rome during the Middle Ages, by *Papencordt*, p. 342; by *Gregorovius*, Vols. VI. and VII.; by *Reumont*, Vol. II., p. 713 sq., and Vol. III., Pt. I. † *Chavin de Malan*, History of St. Catharine of Siena, Pt. II., ch. 12 (declamatory). †**Schwab*, John Gerson, Professor of Theology and Chancellor of the University of Paris. Würzburg, 1858.

§ 266. *Translation of the Holy See to Avignon—Benedict XI.* (*October* 22, 1303, *to July* 7, 1304)—*Clement V.* (*June* 5, 1305, *to April* 20, 1314).

TEN days after the death of Boniface VIII., Nicholas Boccasini, formerly General of the Dominicans, but then Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, was elected his successor by the unanimous vote of the Sacred College, and, as Pope, took the name of *Benedict XI.* Of a naturally gentle disposition, and inclined to peace, he withdrew the censures resting

upon the cardinals, James and Peter Colonna, and upon their brothers and cousins, and Philip, King of France. He also modified considerably the bull "*Clericis laicos*." He, however, pronounced sentence of excommunication against the leaders of the late conspiracy, but particularly against *Nogaret* and *Sciarra Colonna;* and the two Cardinals of the Colonna family were forbidden to put on the purple until further notice, a circumstance which deprived them of a vote in the conclave, after the death of Benedict,[1] who died at *Perugia*, July 7, 1304.

Philip the *Insolent*, as John von Müller calls him, availed himself of the eight months of peace, during Benedict's pontificate, to make the Holy See wholly subservient to the interests of France. By his influence he succeeded in creating a division in the Conclave. One party desired a Pope favourable to the interests of Boniface; the other, one who would promote the interests of Philip. The astute king contrived to direct the choice of the cardinals, in the eleventh month of the Conclave, on *Bertrand de Got*, Archbishop of Bordeaux,[2] who, he *felt* sure, would be the pliant instrument of his will, notwithstanding that the archbishop had, in the contest between him and the Pope, sided with the latter.

The new Pope took the name of *Clement V.* In spite of the remonstrances of the cardinals he persisted in remaining in France, and by his determination to be crowned at Lyons, took the initiative step to the seventy years' captivity. During the solemn procession at the coronation, twelve persons were killed by the falling of a wall; Charles of Valois, the king's brother, was wounded; the Pope thrown from his horse, which Philip was leading, and, in the confusion, a precious jewel was forced from its setting in his tiara and lost. After raising many of his own relatives to ecclesiastical dignities, and servilely complying with the wishes of the French court, by recalling the bull "*Clericis laicos*," and modifying the "*Unam sanctam;*" and by restoring the colonnas to their former offices and honours, and granting to Philip the tithes of the French Church for

[1] *Hefele*, The Restoration of the Colonnas, A. D. 1304. Correction of the text of the papal decree (Tübg. Quart. of Theology, 1866, nro. 3).

[2] See *Christophe's* detailed researches in his history of the Papacy in the fourteenth century, in which, following the trustworthy narration of *Feretti of Vicenza*, he refutes the account of the election of Clement V., as given by *Villani* (and constantly repeated by others), who pretends that *Bertrand de Got* had a secret conference with Philip in a lonely chapel in the forest of Saint-Jean d'Angély, by which he solemnly bound himself, if elected Pope—1. To absolve Philip from all censures passed on him by Boniface VIII.; 2. To reconcile him unconditionally to the Church of Rome; 3. To grant him the tithes and revenues of France for five years; 4. To set a brand upon the memory of Boniface and to erase his name from the catalogue of popes; and, 5. To raise to the rank of cardinal candidates proposed by the French king. A sixth article was also signed, but this was to remain secret until the proper time had come for its disclosure. This compact, which would have made Clement a simoniacal pope, fortunately existed only in the fertile brain of its inventor. All writers who give it refer as their authority to Villani, the contemporary of Clement. No mention of it is to be found in any other contemporary author. *Darras*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 461. (Tr.) *Rabani*, Clement V. et Philippe le Bel, Paris, 1861. See Tübg. Quart., 1861, p. 492 sq.

five years, Clement, altogether abandoning the thought of taking up his residence in the Capital of the West, in the See of St. Peter and beside the Tomb of the Apostles, went to bury himself in *Avignon* (1309), an obscure corner of Gaul, which had not even pleasant scenery and salubrity of climate to recommend it.[1] It seems Clement did not appreciate the significance of the fact, that in Ancient Rome and the surrounding country Providence had provided a temporal dominion for the Vicar of Jesus Christ, sufficiently large to secure *his independence*, and yet too small to inspire fear to other powers.[2]

He might allege in his defence that Benedict XI., unable to assert his authority amid the conflict of parties, was forced to quit Rome; that if such was the fate of one who was an Italian by birth, and had the sympathy of powerful Italian houses, much more so would it be the case with himself, who had no such claims to recommend him; and, finally, that apart from the dissensions in Rome, all Italy was torn by the quarrels of the Guelfs and Ghibellines.

A dangerous illness roused the conscience of Clement somewhat, and after his recovery he recalled the disgraceful grants of bishoprics and monasteries "*in commendam*" made by his predecessors, and steadily refused the request of Philip to erase the name of Boniface from the catalogue of Popes, and dishonour his remains, stating that an act of this importance required the authorisation of an Œcumenical Council, which he would shortly convoke to meet at Lyons. In everything else, or very nearly, Clement was ready to gratify the wishes of Philip, upon whose persistent application he summoned the accusers and defenders of the late Pope, to meet before a consistory, at Avignon (1310), *even prior* to the convocation of the Œcumenical Council of Vienne, where *Nogaret*, *du Plessis*, and others drew upon themselves the indignation of those present by accusing *Boniface* of the abominable crimes of *heresy*, *idolatry*, and *unnatural lust*. The nomination of *nine French* Cardinals at one time, and *six* more shortly after, led to the belief that Clement wished to have successors who would be in sympathy with his principles, and pursue his policy.

Indulgent and partial to France and Frenchmen, he was haughty

[1] "Avenio ventosa —— Sine vento venosa —— Cum vento fastidiosa," says a popular proverb.

[2] *Chateaubriand*, Genie du christianisme, Partie IV., livre VI., chapitre VI.: Papes et cour de Rome (ed. Paris, 1802, T. IV., p. 280). To the same effect is the celebrated passage of *Bossuet*: "It is the will of God that the Church of Rome, the universal mother of all nations, should be dependent on none in her temporal relations, and that the Apostolic See, where all the faithful must preserve unity, should be raised above the strife of parties called forth by conflicting political claims and divergent interests." Cf. *Artaud*, Histoire de Pie VII., Paris, 1836, Vol. II., Pt. I., p. 181, and *Pacca*, Memorie storiche, Roma, 1830, Parte I., p. 13. Also *John von Müller*, History of Switz., Vol. III., c. 1: "It is absolutely necessary that the Pope should have his own capital, that he may be under the influence of no one." Cf. *Höfler*, the Popes of Avignon, the Height and Decline of their Power, being a lecture delivered in the Imperial and Royal Academy of Vienna, 1871.

and severe in his relations with the princes and prelates of every other country. He placed the Venetians under interdict (1309), thus cutting them off from commercial intercourse with the rest of the Christian world, because they had taken possession of Ferrara, and offered indignities to the Papal nuncios.[1] In Germany, after the death of Albert I. (of Austria), he opposed the election of Charles of Valois, brother of Philip the Fair, and supported that of the Count of Luxemburg, who, on the motion of the Archbishop of Mentz, received the votes of the electors, and took the name of Henry VII. When envoys from Henry presented themselves before the Pope, at Avignon, and promised to be faithful to the Church and defend her interests, Clement commissioned five cardinals to proceed to Rome and crown him emperor. Henry led an expedition into Italy to restore the imperial authority there, and put a period to the strife of the Guelfs and Ghibellines.[2]

Dante, who had complained frequently and bitterly of the absence of the Emperor Albert, hailed with all the ardour of his impetuous nature the new monarch as the saviour of his oppressed country, so long the prey of petty tyrants. The Ghibellines took sides with the emperor, the Guelfs with *Robert of Anjou*, whom the Pope recognised King of Naples, in 1309. In answer to Clement, who commanded the emperor and Charles to desist from the deadly struggle in which they were now engaged, the former replied that, being only protector of the Roman Church, but, unlike the King of Naples, holding no fief of the Pope, he was entirely independent of him in *temporal* affairs. It was not long, however, until the emperor overstepped the legitimate limits of his power by declaring Charles under the ban of the empire, and pronouncing sentence of death against him. He himself died shortly after, August 24, 1313.

King Philip, who was equally anxious to dishonour the memory of Boniface VIII., and to strike a decisive blow at the Order of the *Templars*, pressed Clement V. to convoke an Œcumenical Council at Vienne (August 12, 1308). There were many grounds of complaint against the Knights Templars. While in Palestine they had manifested a spirit of pride and insubordination in their dealings with the Patriarch of Jerusalem, a disposition to quarrel with the Knights of St. John, and had frequently shown but scant courtesy to the Popes; and after taking up their residence in France, they made themselves frequently obnoxious by their opposition to the French kings, and particularly to Philip the Fair. In the war between the houses of Aragon and Anjou, they espoused the cause of the former, and in the contest between Philip and Boniface VIII. they were among the defenders of the latter. So determined was their hostility to Philip, that they refused to pay him the tithes subsequently

[1] Cf. *Raynald*, Annal. ad an. 1309, nros. 6 and 7.

[2] *Nicolai episc. Botrontin.*, Relatio de Henrici VII. itinere (*Muratori*, T. XIII.) *Berthold*, Roman Campaign of Henry of Luxemburg, 2 vols., Königsberg, 1830, sq.

granted by the Pope. Moreover, the French king suspected them of complicity in the insurrection of Paris, of which the ostensible cause was the deterioration of the coin, and was only waiting a plausible pretext to suppress the Order. He would probably never have ventured to take this step had not the unprecedented privileges enjoyed by the Templars, their excessive wealth, their magnificence, and luxurious mode of living, already given great scandal, and excited the jealousy of many. Their palace in Paris, called the "*Temple*," was more spacious and splendid than any belonging to the king, and was capable of housing a large army. The opportunity so long and anxiously desired by Philip finally came. A man by the name of *Squin de Florian*, languishing in prison, promised, upon condition of obtaining his freedom, to make known some startling facts concerning the abominations practised in the Order, which, he said, one of his fellow-prisoners, a Templar, had revealed to him. Upon this information, the king had a number of the Templars arrested and brought to trial (1307), when, it is claimed, they admitted the truth of the charges imputed to them.

The Templars, being a religious Order, were under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See, and hence the necessity of proceeding cautiously in their prosecution, the more so as the Pope was at first little inclined to credit the startling and monstrous stories put in circulation against them. In the meantime, Philip resolved upon a thorough and decisive measure. On the 13th of October, 1307, in obedience to sealed orders issued to the royal officers, all the Templars of France were put under arrest, and their "*Temple*" and other property seized and confiscated. The suddenness and completeness of the measure took everyone by surprise, and excited no little discontent among the people, whereupon a royal proclamation was issued, justifying the course of the king. It was here claimed that the Order was "*corrupt, heretical, and immoral; that a candidate for admission into the body was first required to spit upon and trample under foot the crucifix; to worship an idol with long hair and flaming red eyes; to deny the existence of God; and it was further asserted, that all the members were permitted to practise unnatural lust, and that, if any of their members should, in violation of his vow, have begotten a child, the infant was to be broiled, and the beard of the idol besmeared with the drippings.*" Charges so monstrous and absurd were intended, and probably calculated, to work upon the imagination of the illiterate classes, and fill them with horror of a body of men in which they were said to be perpetrated. At the commencement of these violent and illegal proceedings, Clement protested, in a bull, against the action of Philip, warning him that "he had overstepped the limits of the royal authority in constituting himself judge of the immediate subjects of the Holy See;" and, not confining himself to remonstrances alone, suspended the powers of the archbishops, bishops, and inquisitors of France, and summoned the Templars before his own tribunal for trial. When, however, the *evidence was laid before him*, he felt it his duty to

consent to their imprisonment, and to order further depositions to be taken in the various dioceses throughout France. A bull (*Pastoralis præeminentiæ solio*) was accordingly issued, November 22, 1307, to this effect, but not until after the king had surrendered to the papal commissioner both the persons and the sequestered property of the Templars. The reports, as elicited both by the secular courts and canonical procedure, were conflicting and contradictory in the extreme.

While, on the one hand, it was claimed that confessions inculpating the Templars were made freely and without constraint by every officer, from the Grand Master down to the humblest in the Order, it was contended, on the other, that the torture employed to extort damnatory evidence was so terrible in character, that, as *Aymer of Villars* afterwards affirmed, he would, while undergoing its pain, and in the extremity of death, have admitted, had it been required of him, that he was the murderer of our Lord. It is, however, a little remarkable, that those professing their innocence gave no such tokens of steadfastness and adherence to principle as were exhibited by the martyrs, even among the weaker sex, in the early days of the Church. But again, it seems strange that the members of an Order bearing witness against it, should not have been brought face to face with those against whom they deposed, and that the officers, despite their frequent demands, should have been denied the privilege of appearing personally before the Pope; and it is no less strange, that those who declared both themselves and the other members of their Order guilty of abominable crimes, should have been treated with unusual and suspicious leniency. Finally, the fact that the investigations made in all other countries *except France*, were favourable to the Templars, cannot be overlooked in forming a judgment of their guilt or innocence. The members of the Order examined in Spain, declared that it passed their comprehension how their brothers in France could have testified to wickedness so enormous and incredible.

After these preliminary labours, Pope Clement convoked, by the bull *Regnans in cœlis*, an Œcumenical Council, at Vienne, to give final judgment in the matter. The Council was also to set at rest for ever the question concerning *Boniface VIII.*, and to enact decrees for the *reformation of the Church in her Head and members*, as the phrase ran, in the admirable memorial[1] of *William Durandus*, the Younger, Bishop of Menda.

FIFTEENTH ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL (OCTOBER 16, 1311, TO MAY 6, 1312).

There were present at this Council one hundred and fourteen (not

[1] De modo celebrandi generalis concilii, ed. *Probus*, Paris, 1545, and oftener; ed. (*Fabre*), Paris. 1671. Cf. *Bzovii*, Annal. ad an. 1311, nro. 1.

300) archbishops and bishops, among whom were the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and a number of Oriental prelates.[1]

Notwithstanding that many evil reports were still afloat derogatory to the reputation of Boniface,[2] the council declared the charges of immorality against him unfounded, and his memory free from taint of heresy. With regard to the Templars,[3] it yielded to the wish of the king, who professed himself ready, in case the Order was suppressed, either to apply their property and estates to defraying the expenses of a crusade or to transfer them to another military religious order; but in the meantime he was careful to keep his army encamped before the walls of Vienne, to act as a menace upon the council. Owing to the suspicious methods employed in conducting the proceedings against the Templars, the Fathers at first demanded that they should be permitted to speak personally in their own defence before the council; but, for some reason not explained, they consented, in a private consistory, held March 22, 1312, to the suppression of the Order. The bull states, however, that the suppression is not to be understood as a condemnation of the Order (*via condemnationis*), but as required by circumstances (*via provisionis*)—that is, not because the members had been proven *de jure* guilty of crimes, but because the interests of the Church demanded the suppression of their body. The disposal of their personal property and real estate was reserved to the Pope. The Fathers declared that the confessions *laid before them* were sufficient evidence of guilt. It is to be remarked, however, that while

---

[1] The invitation to this Council in the bull of April 27, 1311, in *Raynald.* ad an. 1311, nro. 26; the acts in *Mansi*, T. XXV., p. 367-426; *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 1321-1361. Cf. **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 388 sq.

[2] For example, Card. *Nicholas*, formerly confessor to the French king, affirmed, on oath, that, "On hearing of the canonisation of St. Louis, the king said it was a source of general rejoicing, but many expressed a wish 'quod ejusmodi canonizatio fuisset facta ab alio Papa probo viro et Catholico bonæ famæ.'" Cf. *Hefele*, pp. 391-415.

[3] In the bull of suppression "Ad providam Christi," in *Mansi*, T. XXV., p. 389 sq. *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 1340 sq. The Pope says: "Ordinis statum, habitum atque nomen, non sine cordis amaritudine et dolore et *sacro approbante concilio*, non per modum definitæ sententiæ, cum eam super hoc, secundum inquisitiones et processus super his habitos, *non possemus ferre de jure*, sed *per viam provisionis* seu ordinationis Apostolicæ irrefragabili ac perpetuo valitura sustulimus sanctione, ipsum prohibitioni perpetuæ supponentes. Universa etiam bona ordinis prælibati Apostolicæ sedis ordinationi et dispositioni Apostolica auctoritate duximus reservanda." Contemporaries accused the king of desiring the suppression of the Templars, in order to secure their property; but as it was nearly all transferred to the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, this seems hardly probable. *J. Bulæi*, Hist. Univ. Par., T. IV., p. 110. *Natal Alexandri*, H. e. sæc. XIV. diss. X. de causa Templariorum. The abolition is still taxed with injustice by *Antoninus Florent.*, in *Raynald.* ad a. 1307, nro. 12, and *Trithemius* (†1516). Cf. *P. Dupuy*, Hist. de la condemnation des Templiers, Paris, 1650, 4to, enlarged, Brux., 1751, 4to. On the other hand, nearly every French historian of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries maintained that the guilt of the Order was established. *Raynouard*, Monumens hist. relatifs à la condamnation des chevaliers du temple, etc., Paris, 1813. *Hammer-Purgstall*, Mysterium Baphometis (the name of a symbol of the Templars) revelatum, seu fratres militiæ templi, Viennæ, 1818. *Raynouard* wrote answers to this work in the Journal des Savans, 1819; also *Puttrich*, Architectural Monuments of the Middle Ages in Saxony, Vol. I., Pt. III., p. 29. But the *French* sources but *lately* published, such as Procès des Templiers, etc., Paris, 1841-51, have furnished a result rather unfavourable to the Order. See *Theiner*, in the Tübing. Quart., 1832, p. 681. An English work, written by *C. C. Addison*, entitled "History of the Knights Templars," notwithstanding its manifest advocacy of the Order, accuses the Templars of a certain religious scepticism on the Divinity of Christ. See also Règle et statuts *secrets* (*?*) des Templiers précédés de l'histoire de l'établissement, de la destruction et de la continuation moderne de l'ordre du Temple, etc., par *C. H. Maillard de Chambure* Paris, 1841. But, despite the most searching investigations at the abolition of the Order, other statutes could not be found anywhere than those *generally* known, and adduced by us, Vol. II., page 504, note. Conf. *Palma*, Prælectiones hist. eccl., T. III., Pt. II., p. 191-210. *Soldan*, Procès des Templiers (*Raumer*, Manual of History, 1844). *Havemann*, Hist. of the Suppression of the Order of Templars, Tübg., 1846. Careful examination of all the proceedings, in *Damberger*, Vols. XII. and XIII.; especially in *Héfele*, Hist. of Counc., l. c. Cf. *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclopædia, Vol. X., p. 716-736; French transl., Vol. 23, p. 186-208. *O. A. Haye*, Persecution of the Knights Templars, Edinburgh, 1865.

the witnesses were themselves Templars, their depositions were made, as a rule, not before papal, but royal commissioners. According to the testimony, said to have been freely given, the Templars were accused of making shipwreck of the faith, of corrupt and immoral practices, and of other crimes, for all which more definite and reliable proof has been furnished in *recent* times. Many opposed the publication of the proceedings of the trial when it finally closed, from a fear that a knowledge of such crimes might accustom men to regard them with less horror, and thus eventually lead to their perpetration. In justice to the committee commissioned to draw up the report, it must be said that a majority of their number were in favour of opening the trial anew and giving the Order the benefit of a fresh defence.

There were other matters before the Council of Vienne more directly bearing on faith and morals. The false mysticism of the *Fratricelli*, *Dulcinists*, *Beghards*, and *Beguines*, as dangerous as it was criminal, was condemned, and decrees enacted for the reformation of discipline in both male and female religious communities, for correcting the morals of the secular clergy, and for the better administration of charitable institutions, now presided over, not by the clergy, but by *laymen*. It was also ordained that a *tithe* should be levied upon all ecclesiastical benefices, during *six* years, for the support of Christians in the Holy Land, and, as has been already stated, that *Hebrew*, *Arabic*, and *Chaldaic* should be taught wherever the Roman court was held, and in the universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca.

When the Pope, in virtue of his reserved jurisdiction, finally condemned some of the most distinguished Templars to perpetual imprisonment, and among them the Grand Master, *James of Molay*, and *Guy*, the brother of the Dauphin of Auvergne and Grand-Preceptor of Narbonne, these retracted their former confessions, stating they had been extorted by violence, and protested their innocence. Molay, in his retractation, said: "Standing at the threshold of death, when the slightest deviation from truth is fraught with danger, I declare before heaven and earth, that I have committed the most grievous of crimes, and exposed myself to a terrible death, because, mistaking the fair words of King and Pope, and wishing to escape painful torture and save my own life, I have borne false witness against my Order. I will not be brought by fear of death to give utterance to a second falsehood. If such be the price of my life, I had rather die than submit to so great an infamy." Guy of Auvergne made a similar recantation. Their example, however, was not followed by their fellow-prisoners, Hugh Peyraud, Visitor of France, and Geoffrey of Gonneville, Preceptor of Aquitaine, who steadily maintained the truth of their first assertions. The tardiness of a legal process little accorded with the impetuous temper of Philip, who, hearing of the action of the two Templars, had them dragged away, while the judges were still deliberating on their fate, to an island of the Seine, situated where the present Pont-Neuf crosses that river, and there burned alive (March 18, 1314). This was but a piece with the arbitrary acts of Philip during the years 1310 and 1311, as exemplified in the death of fifty-nine Templars, who, refusing to confess the truth of the crimes imputed to the Order, were adjudged worthy of death by their declared enemy, *Philip Marigny*, Archbishop of Sens, and, by the king's order, burned alive in Paris, near Porte Saint-Antoine. Both the king and the Pope died shortly after the execution of Molay and Guy—the latter, April 20, and the former, September 29, 1314. Their death, occurring so shortly after the suppression of the Templars, was regarded by some as a visi-

tation of Providence. Since all the acts of the Council of Vienne have not been preserved, and of those that have come down to us, many passages have been falsified, it is impossible to obtain an authentic statement of the affairs of the Templars, and the verdict of history in their regard is consequently the reverse of uniform.

King Philip was succeeded by his eldest son, *Louis X.*, surnamed the Brawler (*le Hutin*).

§ 267. *John XXII.* (*August* 7, 1316, *to December* 4, 1334)—*Benedict XII.* (*December* 20, 1334, *to April* 25, 1342)—*Clement VI.* (*May* 7, 1342, *to December* 6, 1352)—*Struggle with Louis the Bavarian.*

Chronicon. Ludov. IV. imp. (*Pezii*, Scriptt. Aust., T. II., p. 415.) *Henrici de Rebdorf*, Chronica, 1295-1363. *Freheri*, Scriptt. Germ. ed. Struve, T. I., p. 598. *Gualvanei de la Flamma*, De reb. gestis a vicecomitib. (*Muratori*, Scriptt., T. XII.) *Viti Arnpeckhii*, Chronicon Bavar. (*Pezii*, Thesaur. anecdot., T. III., Pt. III.) *Christophe*, L. c. (Germ. by *Ritter*, Vol. II., p. 1-28.) *Herwart ab Hohenburg*, Ludov. IV. imp. defensus contra *Bzovium* (Annal. eccl., T. I., P. I., p. 412 sq.), Monach., 1618, 4to. *Gewoldi*, Defensio Ludov. IV. imp., Ingolst. 1618, 4to. *Olenschläger*, Polit. Hist. of the Roman Empire during the first half of the fourteenth century, Frankfort, 1755, 4to. The works of *Weech* and *Schreiber*.

After the death of Clement, the Holy See remained vacant two years. A conclave was held at Lyons, where, after a protracted and bitter struggle between the Italian and French cardinals, the choice finally fell upon James of Ossa, a native of Cahors, and at the time of his promotion, Cardinal-Bishop of Porto, who took the name of *John XXII.* Villani, the Florentine statesman, represents this Pope as a religiously minded man, versed in theology and canon law, a promoter of learning, friendly to the universities, of a penetrating mind, and pursuing an enlightened policy in all important affairs. As he at once took up his residence at *Avignon*, laid the foundation of a papal palace, and created at one time out of eight, *seven* French cardinals and one Italian, it was evident he had made up his mind to follow in the footsteps of his immediate predecessor. He possessed a marvellous capacity for the administration of public affairs.[1] Notwithstanding that he was dependent on France, he offered (1317) his mediation between Frederick, Duke of Austria, and Louis of Bavaria, who, after the death of Henry VII., had taken up arms against each other for the possession of the empire. Grounding himself on precedent, he announced that, during the vacancy of the empire, the administration of the Italian provinces appertaining to it, belonged to the Pope, and that consequently, *he alone* had the right of nominating an imperial vicar in Italy. Pope John confirmed in this office Robert of Naples, whom Clement had appointed in 1314, after the death of the emperor, Henry VII., but the Ghibelline vicars, appointed by the emperor previously to his death, now used their power to oppress the Guelfs. The Pope threatened them with excommunication, if they would not at

[1] The Regests compiled from his public acts fill 59 vols., containing 60,000 documents, whilst those of *Clement V.* fill but 7 vols., containing 7,248 letters. Cf. *Dudik*, Iter Rom., Vienna, 1855, T. II., p. 46.

once relinquish all pretensions to the vicariate and recognise Robert, whom he now authorized to hold the office until after the coronation of the emperor. Frederic of Austria was captured by *Louis the Bavarian*, at the battle of Mühldorf, in 1322, after which the latter, without consulting the Pope, assumed the title of King of the Romans, and hastened to send aid to the already defeated Ghibellines. The indignant Pontiff, by a bull, issued October 8, 1323, required Louis, inasmuch as doubtful elections were to be referred to the Holy See, to leave off the exercise of all imperial functions and appear personally before him within three months.[1] Louis, feigning compliance with the papal command, sent an embassy requesting a prolongation of the period within which he was to appear, but at the same time protested at the diet of Nürnberg against the right claimed by the Pope, stating that he recognised the electoral vote as the only source and sanction of his authority. The Pope granted an extension of time to Louis, but the latter, now assuming an aggressive tone, charged the former with protecting heresy, and disturbing the public peace, and was, in consequence, excommunicated, and his empire laid under interdict (October 1, 1324). Louis retaliated, somewhat in the spirit of Henry IV. and Philip the Fair, by the publication of a memorial, in which the Pope was styled "*the so-called Pope John*, an enemy of the public peace, a heretic, the destroyer of the rights of princes, and the author of all the evils which then afflicted and desolated Germany and Italy." An angry and *acrimonious correspondence* was now opened between them,[2] in the course of which it became abundantly evident that the isolated instances of the arbitrary exercise of authority by a few of the last occupants of the Holy See, but notably their *partiality for France*, had considerably diminished the prestige of the Chair of Peter, and evoked throughout Christendom feelings of indifference and distrust towards it. The publication of the papal censures by Burchard, Archbishop of Magdeburg, cost that prelate his life; and the three ecclesiastical electors, regardless of the papal excommunication, took part in the celebration of Louis' espousals.

In enumerating the enemies of the Pope, the names of two doctors of the University of Paris should not be omitted, viz., *Marsilius of Padua* (*de Raymundinis*), who died in 1328, and his assistant, *John of Jandun* († P. A. D. 1338), both of whom were likely under the influence of *Ubertino of Casale*, one of the Spiritualists of Fratricelli (*Spirituales*) whom the Pope had already condemned. Besides, there were *Hangenoer of Augsburg*, private secretary to the emperor; and, above all, *William Occam* (1342), provincial of the

[1] The bull is in *Raynald.* ad an. 1323, nro. 30, and more complete in *Herwart*, Loc. cit., Pt. I., p. 194. The protest of Louis at Nürnberg is in *Herwart*, Pt. I., p. 248, and in *Olenschlæger's* Archives, p. 84. Cf. *von Weech*, Emperor Louis the Bavarian, and King John of Bohemia, with documentary proofs, Munich, 1860. By the *same*, Sixty Documents of Emperor Louis the Bavarian, Munich, 1863.

[2] The first symptoms of ill-will between the two powers which had heretofore gone on so harmoniously is already apparent in *Dante*, Purgator., canto xvi., v. 106-129; *Joannes de Parrhisiis* (Dominican, † 1304), De potestate regia et papali (in *Goldasti*, Monarchia S. Rom. Imp., Frcft. 1611 sq.) (III. T., T. II., 96 and 108), where are also found the other writings *in favour of the emperor*. Cf. *Wm. Schreiber*, The Polit. and Relig. Doctrines prevalent under Louis the Bavarian, Lps., 1858.

condemned Minorites, and in sympathy with them; to whom may be added the more moderate Dominican, *John of Paris*, and *Lupold of Bebenberg*, Bishop of Bamberg († 1354), who, however, laboured strenuously to preserve the respect for papal authority so deeply rooted in the hearts of the people. In the work entitled "*Defensor pacis*," of which Marsilius and John of Jandun were the chief authors, it was maintained that all legislative and judicial authority in the Church resided primarily *in the people*, through whom it was transmitted in trust to the clergy; that all distinctions of rank in the hierarchy derived their origin from the ambition of bishops; that the body of the faithful, through their representative, the emperor, had conferred the primacy on the See of Rome as a matter of convenience and expediency; that the primacy originally implied no more than the right of convoking general councils; and, finally, that the emperor was the proprietor of all church property, and that he alone might appoint or depose a pope, according to his good pleasure. *Occam* did not at first go quite this length. On the whole, he advocated the principles set forth in the "*Monarchia*" of Dante (1321), and, being familiar with classical antiquity, was indebted to this source for the development of his *theory of State power*, so antagonistic to Christian ideas. He denied that the popes had any political rights over the Roman States, maintaining that the absolute power over the whole world claimed and enjoyed by the Roman emperors, and derived immediately from God, had passed in its fulness down to their successors. To demonstrate that the dignity of the King of the Romans was identical with that of the Roman emperors, Occam took every liberty with historical facts, distorting such as he did not discard. *Election in itself*, said he, *even without coronation by the Pope*, conveys sovereign and unlimited power. Nay, more, the emperor has the right both of appointing and judging popes and of convoking œcumenical councils. When his teachings were condemned, Occam, instead of submitting, was so far carried away by polemical pride as to strike at the very root of ecclesiastical authority by denying the infallibility of œcumenical councils.

Lupold of Bebenberg (Bamberg), though not so extreme in his principles or so violent in his advocacy of them as Occam, still pursued the same general line of argument, and in his treatise "*De juribus regni et imperii Romanorum*" attempted to show that the Roman empire was wholly independent of the Church. These imperial pretensions to unlimited power naturally called forth counter-claims from the advocates of papal *supremacy*, which, according to the ingenious computation of a certain glosser upon canon law, transcends the imperal dignity precisely fifty-seven times.[1] An Augustinian hermit of Ancona, named *Augustino Triomfi* (*Augustinus Triumphus*) († 1328), and a Franciscan named *Alvarus Pelagius* († D. A. D. 1340), defended the following propositions:

The Pope alone holds his authority immediately from God. Emperors and all other sovereigns hold theirs from the Pope. The Pope *can, of his own right, name the emperor*, and withdraw, if it please him, from the electors the electoral franchise granted them. The emperor-elect cannot legally exercise the functions of the imperial government until after his election has been confirmed and he himself crowned by the Pope, although he may at once administer the affairs of Germany. Finally, *the Pope has the right of directly nominating the emperor, either by hereditary succession or by electoral vote.*[2]

Extravagant claims such as these were little calculated to conciliate hostile minds, or to set at rest doubts concerning the authority of the Holy See. Even the most zealous advocates of the ancient order of things began to fear that the growing discontent would eventually work the ruin of the supremacy of the Pope. This is evident from a much later work by the canon *Peter of Andlau* († 1475),[3] who, despite his ardent attachment to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, could not conceal his fears that he was performing a useless labour in defending it.

---

[1] A parallelism between the papacy and the empire and the sun and moon is drawn out in the Glossa ad cap. Solitæ, 6. De majoritate et obedientia, where it is said: "Igitur cum terra sit septies major luna, sol autem octies est major terra, constat ergo ut pontificalis dignitas quinquagesies septies sit major regali dignitate, etc." Cf. *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. III., p. 183.

[2] *Augustinus Triumphus*, Summa de potestate ecclesiastica ad Joh. Pap. XXII. Aug., Vind., 1473; Rom., 1582. *Alvarus Pelagius*, De planctu ecclesiæ. libb. II., Ulm., 1474; Ven. 1560 f. Cf. *Schwab*, Gerson, p. 24 sq.

[3] De imperio Romano, Regis et Augusti creatione, inauguratione, administratione; officio et potestate Electorum, etc., libb. II., ed cum notis *Marg. Freheri*, Argent., 1603-12; Norimb., 1657. Cf. *Buss*, in the Freiburg Periodical. Vol. IV., p. 413-416.

Louis of Bavaria, after his reconciliation with Frederic of Austria, led his army to Milan (1327), where he was crowned King of Lombardy, and thence proceeding to Rome, accompanied by a number of schismatical bishops and monks, practically carried out the teachings of his partisans and defenders. Arrived at Rome, he received the imperial crown from the hands of Sciarra Colonna, "*Capitano del popolo*," and was anointed by two of the schismatical bishops. He next conferred the rank of Senator upon Castruccio, the despot of Lucca, and named Marsilius of Padua vicar of the Roman States. His orthodoxy was so very pure and his patriotism so sensitive, that he decreed the death-penalty against those guilty of the crimes of heresy and high-treason.[1] Finally, on the 14th of April, 1328, proceeding to the great square of St. Peter's Church, surrounded by all the pomp and circumstance of imperial authority, he ascended a raised throne and ordered his chancellor to read a proclamation, which, after denouncing the Pope as guilty of high-treason, went on to declare that, "the priest, James of Cahors, who styles himself Pope John XXII., is hereby deposed from the papacy and from every other ecclesiastical rank and dignity, and ordered to be handed over to the imperial officers, to be punished as a heretic." To complete the sacrilegious farce, Louis had only to create an antipope. Accordingly, four days later, the Romans were again summoned to the great square of St. Peter's. Two thrones were erected side by side on the steps of the Church, one of which was occupied by the emperor, and the other by Pietro Rainalducci of Corbario, in the diocese of Rieti, one of the Fratricellian Spiritualists, upon whose finger the emperor put the Fisherman's ring, and whom he named Pope *Nicholas V.* Nicholas was the last of the *imperial* antipopes, and Louis the last of the German emperors, who incurred sentence of excommunication.

Louis' triumph was of short duration. On the following day, James Colonna read publicly the sentence of excommunication against Louis, and barely escaped with his life from the vengeance of the imperial guards, thus, in a measure, expiating by this act of courageous devotion to the Holy See, the former misdeeds of his house. Warned by the near approach of Robert, King of Naples, at the head of a victorious army, Louis and his antipope fled from Rome amid the derisive shouts of an indignant populace. Most of the Italian cities and many of the Ghibelline leaders forsook his cause, and sought a reconciliation with the Pope. The antipope, who had been left at Pisa to provide for himself as best he could, being obliged to fly from that city, hastened to Avignon, publicly confessed his faults, and threw himself upon the mercy of John XXII., who gave him the kiss of peace, and treated him until his death, in 1333, with kindness and consideration.

The interdict, which followed the excommunication of Louis, produced so powerful a reaction against him in Germany, that he made

[1] *Ficker*, Documents supplementary to the history of the Roman campaign of Louis the Bavarian, Innsbruck, 1865. *Kopp*, Frederic and Louis, the two kings in opposition. Brl., 1865.

every effort, after the year 1330, to have it removed. He engaged John, King of Bohemia, and Baldwin, Archbishop of Treves, to interpose in his behalf, and through them made the most humble and conciliatory advances to the Pope,[1] who, however refused to listen to any terms recognising his title to the imperial throne. Despairing of an accommodation, Louis at length privately proposed to resign in favour of his cousin Henry, Duke of Lower Bavaria, but through the imprudence of the latter in divulging the secret, was led to withdraw the proposal and maintain himself at every risk. He at once proceeded to extremities against the Pope. Allying himself to the chief of the Spiritualists, he sought, through the co-operation of Cardinal Napoleon Orsini, to convoke a general council before which the Pope was to have been arraigned for *heresy* and deposed. It seems that *in some of his sermons*, John XXII. had expressed the opinion, much in favour in the Eastern Church, that departed souls would not enjoy the intuitive vision of God until after the general judgment and resurrection of the body. The Dominican Order and the University of Paris promptly rejected the opinion. In the meantime John died (December 4, 1334), leaving a well-filled exchequer, whose wealth, amounting to eighteen millions of gold florins and seven millions in jewels, was derived chiefly from *annats*, or the first year's revenue of a vacant bishopric; from *expectancies*, or moneys paid by clerics to the Pope for letters securing them the first benefices that should fall vacant; and from the *tithe*, or a levy amounting to the tenth of its value on all property. It was said that the Pope was accumulating this wealth to undertake a new crusade, and to put him in a position to restore the pontifical residence to Rome.

In answer to the imputation of heresy, John replied that he had simply given the opinion for what it was worth, without intending to put it forward as his own belief, and when, on his death-bed, he made a public profession of the orthodox faith, concerning the Beatific Vision, saying, "*that the purified souls enjoy the company of Christ, and the fellowship of the angels in heaven, where they see God face to face.*"

He was succeeded by Cardinal James Fournier, a Cistercian monk, as *Benedict XII.*, who at once set about reforming the papal household, strengthening the discipline, and correcting the morals of monks and the secular clergy,[2] and reducing the imposts which had grown so burdensome as to excite universal complaint. By the bull "*Benedictus Deus*," issued February 4, 1336, he set at rest the question of the intuitive vision, defining that "just souls, having no guilt to expiate, enjoy it immediately after death." Though desirous of being free from the influence of the French court, and meditating a return to Rome, he nevertheless completed the papal palace at Avignon, commenced by his predecessor. He was disposed to treat Louis justly, if not kindly, and the latter reciprocated by proposing, in 1335, to

[1] *Dominicus*, Baldwin of Luxemburg, Archbishop of Treves, Coblenz, 1862.

[2] Ordinationes et Reformationes, etc., in Bullario magno, T. I., p. 242 sq., and Constitutio totius ordin. Canonicor. regulæ ord. Sti. Aug., ibid., p. 259.

accede to any terms that could be fairly required of him. Benedict, however, found it impossible to entirely overcome the baneful influence of the French cardinals and the courts of France and Naples. Everything was put in the way of a reconciliation with Louis, and the well-meaning Pontiff could do no more to alleviate the sufferings of Germany than to abstain from publishing any further censures against her monarch. When it became known that the Pope was favourably inclined to Louis, the *Electors* met at *Frankfort* (1338), declared the emperor innocent of the charges that had occasioned the interdict, and pronounced any ecclesiastic, who should observe its provisions, a disturber of the public peace.[1] Shortly after the electors, falling into the mistake of previous writers, in confounding the emperor's office as protector of the Church with his dignity of King of the Germans, came together in the diet of *Rhense*[2] (July 15, 1338), and drew up and published a decree, affirming that "the imperial dignity is derived immediately from God; that election is the sole title to imperial authority; that a papal confirmation is derogatory to the majesty of the empire; and that whosoever holds differently shall be adjudged guilty of high treason." The controversy grew in heat and acrimony, and among the advocates of the imperial party, the most notorious and vehement was the perfidious *William of Occam*. Louis was perhaps the worst enemy to his own cause, by his unwarrantable aggressions upon the most sacred of ecclesiastical rights. He, of his own *authority*, granted a *divorce* to Margaret Maultasch, Duchess of Carinthia and Countess of Tyrol, from her marriage with prince John Henry, son of the King of Bohemia, and *a dispensation from the impediment of kindred*, between her and his own son, the Marquis of Brandenburg, and had their union solemnised with royal pomp and splendour in 1340. From the extreme of arrogance he passed to the extreme of pusillanimous fear, thus placing an impassable barrier between himself and the Pope on the one hand, and on the other alienating for ever the popular sympathy, a large measure of which he had thus far enjoyed.[3]

Benedict's successor, *Clement VI.*, a man of extravagant and luxurious habits, was now in a position to act more energetically against Louis, while the electors, on the other hand, assailed him with the most bitter reproaches. He was commanded, by a bull dated April, 1343, to appear before the Pope at Avignon, and finding himself deserted by his friends, he signed a document by which he promised, among other things, to acknowledge that he had obtained the empire by unjust means, to recall all his acts as emperor, and to receive whatever penance the Pope might inflict upon him. This proving unsatisfactory at Avignon, he was further required to recall

[1] *First Assembly of Electors and Princes*, in *Gewold*, L. c., p. 146; *Olenschlæger's* Archives, p. 188.

[2] Not *Reuss*, as *Darras* has in his Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 492.

[3] Tota terra illud matrimonium multifariam multisque modis diris vocibus inculpavit, says *Joh. Vitoduran.*, Chron. ad a. 1342.

all he had done as King of Germany, and to promise to take no further step in public affairs unless with the approbation of the Pope. At a diet held at Frankfort in September, 1344, these conditions were declared degrading to the emperor, and ruinous to the empire, and it was resolved that Louis should not again seek absolution from his censures. Clement, impatient of the vacillating conduct of Louis, published, on Holy Thursday of the year 1346, a bull against him, containing all the terrible forms of *Jewish* imprecation,[1] and an exhortation to the electors to choose as their king, Charles, Margrave of Moravia, son of John, King of Bohemia. This prince was, in fact, elected King of the Romans, by the five electors, at the diet of Rhense,[2] and crowned at Bonn, in 1346, under the title of Charles IV. But the intrigue and corruption by which the votes were procured excited so much indignation that the new king was forced to take refuge in France. Even after the death of Louis, who was stricken with apoplexy, October 11, 1347, while taking part in a chase, Charles, though bearing with him the papal absolution for Germany, was unfavourably received. His claims were opposed by *Günther of Schwarzburg*, and were not admitted until after he had been a second time elected at Frankfort, and crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, in July, 1349.

When the schismatical Minorites, headed by *William of Occam*, were deprived of their protector, they immediately abjured their errors. Danger now menaced the papacy from another quarter. Clement, apart from his extravagant habits and love of splendour, was also open to the charge of nepotism. Of ten cardinals created by him, there were *nine Frenchmen*, five of whom were his own *nephews*, and only one Italian. His *purchase* of the city of *Avignon*, belonging to Joanna, the impoverished Queen of Naples,[3] for the sum of eighty thousand gold florins, seemed to indicate a purpose of permanently fixing the residence of the Pope in France. In spite of acts such as these, so destructive to papal authority, Clement VI. succeeded by his mediation in partially establishing friendly relations between England and France, Hungary and Naples, and the cities of Venice and Genoa.

§ 268. *Innocent VI.* (A. D. 1352-1362)—*Bl. Urban V.* (A. D. 1362-1370)—*Gregory XI.* (A. D. 1370-1378).

Clement VI. was succeeded by the pious, upright, and austere Stephen Aubert, Cardinal-bishop of Ostia, formerly professor of civil

[1] Conf. *Raynald*, Ad a. 1346, nro. 3 sq. The excommunication contains the following words: "Veniat ei laqueus, quem ignorat, et cadat in ipsum. Sit maledictus ingrediens, sit maledictus egrediens. Percutiat eum Dominus amentia et cæcitate ac mentis furore. Cœlum super eum fulgura mittat. Omnipotentis Dei ira et beatorum Petri et Pauli, quorum ecclesiam præsumpsit et præsumit suo posse confundere, in hoc et futuro sæculo exardescat in ipsum. Orbis terrarum pugnet contra eum; aperiatur terra et ipsum absorbeat vivum. In generatione una deleatur nomen ejus, et dispereat de terra memoria ejus, etc."

[2] Not Rheims, as *Darras* erroneously says in his Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 500.

[3] See the document in *Bzovius*, Annal. ecclesiast. ad an. 1348, nro 10, and *Leibnitii*, Cod. jur. gent., Pt. I., p. 200.

law at Toulouse, under the name of *Innocent VI.* A reduction of the burdensome taxes levied by his predecessors had become indispensable, and, to make the measure practicable, he brought the expenses of his court within the limits of the most rigid economy. He also banished from the city a crowd of abandoned women, commanded the cardinals to live less extravagantly, and checked a tendency, now beginning to manifest itself among them, to constitute themselves an exclusive, independent, and *autocratic* body. Previously to his election, they had *severally signed a document* binding themselves, under oath, that whosoever should be elected to the papacy should not raise the number of cardinals above twenty; should not deprive a cardinal of his dignity or imprison him without the assent of two-thirds of the college, nor create new cardinals, nor confer the higher ecclesiastical offices either in the Roman Church or States, nor grant ecclesiastical tithes and subsidies, unless with the same assent; and, finally, prescribing that one-half of the revenues of the Roman Church should be given to them.[1] These articles were declared by Innocent, who had subscribed to them with the condition, "as far as they may be conformable to the laws of the Church," to be null and void.

The exterior policy of Innocent, and his relations to princes, particularly to Peter the Cruel of Castile, were marked with characteristic prudence and a just appreciation of the great changes that had been effected in public opinion. Individuals were indeed excommunicated, and countries laid under interdict, but never without just and sufficient cause; and it must be said, to his honour and credit, that he was strictly impartial in the exercise of his office, as his many public acts abundantly testify.

In Italy republican leaders were still dreaming of recalling from out the depths of the distant past the splendours of heathen Rome, and of again making that once proud city the mistress of the world. In the States of the Church, and particularly in Rome, the absence of papal and the impotency of imperial authority afforded a good opportunity for utopian dreamers to put forth their fine theories of ideal freedom, by which the people were carried to the extremes of absurdity, and, at times, to the confines of madness.

In 1347, the tribune of the people, *Cola di Rienzi*,[2] with the aid of the papal vicar, *Raymond of Orvieto*, putting himself at the head of the Roman citizens, at a time when lawlessness, party feuds, and every sort of disorder were riot in the city, succeeded in establishing the forms of the ancient Roman Republic,[3] restoring order, peace, and

[1] Cf. *Döllinger*, Ch. Hist., Vol. IV., *Cox's* trans., p. 124. (Tr.)

[2] † *Papencordt*, Cola di Rienzi and his Age, from unpublished sources, Hamburg, 1841, sketches a rather flattering pen-picture of the tribune *at the beginning* of his public career. *Schlosser-Kriegk* present the reverse of it in their Univ. Hist., Vol., VIII., p. 190 sq. and p. 207 sq. The *Hist. Polit. Papers*, Vol. XX., p. 469 sq. *Christophe*, Hist of the Papacy during the fourteenth century, Vol. II., p. 111 sq.

[3] On the first day of Lent, 1347, Cola affixed to the door of *San Giorgio in Velabro* (the only church in Rome dedicated to the tutelary saint of England) his celebrated notice announcing the speedy return of the Good Estate: *In breve tempo li Romani torneranno al loro antico buono stato.* (Tr.)

strict justice, and restraining the wild excesses practised by the members and partisans of the degenerate houses of the Colonnas, Orsinis, and Savellis. His sudden elevation was too much for him. His vanity outran his judgment, and he was so insanely foolish as to summon the Pope, to whom he had sworn obedience, the College of Cardinals, the two rival German emperors, Louis and Charles, and the German electors, to appear before a tribunal of the Roman people. He was excommunicated by the papal legate, Cardinal Bertrand de Deux, in December, 1347, and forced to fly the city. He shortly obtained permission to return, was appointed senator by the Pope, and once more established himself in the public favour; but he again indulged in his foolish excesses, excited the hatred and contempt of all classes, and was finally slain in a tumult, in 1354.

In the meantime, the States of the Church had fallen under the power of a number of petty despots, whom Innocent now resolved to displace. Accordingly, in 1353, he sent a considerable army into Italy, under the warlike Cardinal *Albornoz*, through whose tactics and diplomatic skill the papal authority was soon re-established.[1] In the following year (1354), Charles IV. led a small force into Italy, but for the purpose of receiving the royal and imperial crowns rather than with any intention of maintaining his rights. He received the iron crown from the hands of the Archbishop of Milan, February 6, 1355, and was crowned emperor on the 5th of the following April, at Rome, by the cardinals Albornoz and Bertrandi. But the enthusiasm of the Romans, in anticipation of a revival of the past, and the apostrophe of *Petrarca*—"Let the new Augustus return to Italy; let Rome once more behold her bridegroom, and Italy kiss his feet"—were without effect on Charles. He refused to go to Rome, and continued to maintain friendly relations with the Pope.

Innocent, apart from his nepotism and his partiality for the French, from among whom he exclusively chose his candidates for the Sacred College, possessed many and striking virtues, to which full justice was done after his death.[2]

He was succeeded by the abbot of the monastery of St. Victor, at Marseilles, under the name of *Urban V.*, who cultivated, as Pope, the virtues that had distinguished him as a monk. He at once expressed his purpose of restoring the papal residence to Rome, and *Petrarca*, to strengthen his resolution, asked him "if he would not prefer to rise from death to life in the company of the apostles and martyrs of Rome, rather than among the sinners of Avignon?" To revive decaying discipline and check corruption in the Church, he enacted severe laws against the vices of simony and concubinage, forbade extravagance in dress, enforced the duty of residence, and prescribed that provincial synods should be regularly held.

[1] *Lescale*, Vie du grand cardinal Albornoz, Paris, 1629. *Christophe*, Vol. II., p. 175 sq.

[2] By the bull "*De Festo Lanceæ et Clavorum Domini*," he instituted the several feasts of the various Instruments of the Passion. (Tr.)

The predecessors of Urban had been long engaged in a vexatious conflict against *Barnabo Visconti*, the despot of Milan, who, however, defied all their efforts, and laughed at ecclesiastical censures, boasting that within his own dominions he was emperor, Pope, and God. Urban now launched against him the severest anathemas of the Church, rapidly following them up by a crusade (1363). While carrying on the war with all his might, and putting forth every energy to achieve success, Urban was ever ready to listen to proposals of peace (1364).[1] But to re-establish a firm and lasting peace throughout the whole of Italy, all were agreed, required the presence of the Pope in Rome, and Urban, fully realising the truth of the general conviction, returned to Italy, and *entered Rome* (1367), in triumph, amid the joyful acclamations of a grateful people, who, for sixty years, had not gazed upon the successor of St. Peter. Many of the cardinals, on leaving France for the Eternal City, complained that they were going into exile.[2]

The Emperor Charles, who had, in 1365, visited the Pope at Avignon, and offered to subdue Barnabo Visconti, now crossed the Alps, at the head of a considerable army, and obliged that turbulent despot to accept the terms of peace already offered him by Urban. It seemed for a time as if harmony and good-will were again restored between Church and State in Italy, but it was only a brief interval of calm, to be shortly succeeded by the violence of the storm. The emperor, after going to meet the Pope at Viterbo, went in advance of him to Rome, where he met him outside the gate, and, according to the time-honoured custom, seizing the bridle of his horse, conducted him into the city. Urban reciprocated the emperor's services by conferring upon his consort the crown of empress.[3] In the same year the Greek Emperor, *John Palæologus*, came to Rome for the twofold purpose of re-establishing the union between the two Churches of the East and the West, and of securing aid against the aggressions of the Turks. The Pope did indeed attempt to organize a crusade for the East, but the enthusiasm which had once set the martial fires of the West aglow, and thronged the highways of Eastern Europe with great armies, pushing on to the Holy Land, had cooled for ever the hearts of Europeans.

[1] Cf. *Raynald*, Ad an. 1364, nro. 3.

[2] *Christophe*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 251 sq. *L'Abbé Magnan*, Histoire D'Urbain V. et son siècle d'après les manuscrits du Vatican, ed II., Paris, 1863. Cf. Tübg. Quart., 1866, p. 459 sq.

[3] Another proof of the fact is to be found in the prayer, addressed by *Charles* to the following Pope, asking permission to have his son, Wenceslaus, chosen King of the Romans: "Cum autem ad hujusmodi electionis celebrationem nobis viventibus procedi non valeat sine vestro beneplacito, assensu et gratia ac favore, beatitudini vestræ reverenter et humiliter supplicamus, quatenus cum dicti electores dispositi sint de nostro concensu electionem hujusmodi de rege celebrare præfato, etc." Gregory XI. answers: "Nos super præmissis sæpius cogitavimus et cum fratribus nostris collationem habuimus diligentem, et licet electio hujusmodi te vivente minime de jure possit aut debeat celebrari, sperantes tamen publicam utilitatem ex hujusmodi electionis et ejus effectu (dante Deo) proventuram, ut electio prædicta modo præmisso hac vice duntaxat valeat celebrari, nostrum beneplacitum, assensum ac favorem et gratiam auctoritate apostolica tenore præsentium impertimur." *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1376, nro. 13.

No sooner had the Emperor Charles IV. departed, than the situation of Urban became critical in the extreme. After a nomination of cardinals at Montefiascone, in 1368, when out of eight raised to the purple there was only one Englishman and one Italian, while there were *six* Frenchmen, thus giving the latter a preponderance of influence in the college, it was determined, in spite of the tears and entreaties of the pious Franciscan, *Pedro*, Prince of Aragon, and of the illustrious Swedish princess, *St. Bridget*,[1] to again transfer the papal residence to Avignon, September 16, 1370. St. Bridget had warned the Pope that if he returned to France he would not long live to enjoy the peace and quiet of Avignon, and the event verified the prediction, for Urban survived his departure from Rome barely three months. He died, December 19, 1370.

The virtues of Urban, which have merited for him the title of *Saint*, would have done honour to a better age.

He was succeeded by Cardinal Roger, the youthful nephew of Clement VI., a proficient jurist, and a humble and exemplary priest, under the title of *Gregory XI.* The fact of his creating eighteen French cardinals shortly after his accession did not promise well for the future of the Church. He was called to Italy, however, earlier than he had anticipated, by the revolt of *Barnabo Visconti*, and his brother, *Galeazzo* (1372), and by the efforts made by very nearly all the cities of the States of the Church to throw off their allegiance to the Pope, and ally themselves to the Florentines. *Catharine of Siena*, the saintly and influential Dominican nun, had much to do with the return of the Pope to Rome. Visiting Avignon, chiefly for the purpose of negotiating a peace for the Florentines,[2] she insisted on the transference of the Holy See to Italy, and added not a little to the persuasiveness of her appeal by her sincerity, earnestness, and ardour, and by her *miraculous* gift, which enabled her, shortly after her arrival, to lay open the actual condition of the papal court. Persuaded on which side his duty lay, Gregory, accompanied by the whole Sacred College, except six who remained behind, proceeded to Rome, in January, 1377, only to find the States of the Church in the utmost disorder, and Rome itself anything but a secure place of abode. Feeling ran so high in Florence, the source of all the difficulties, that St. Catharine of Siena, who had been sent thither by the Pope, to mediate a peace, succeeded only at the peril of her life in appeasing

[1] Conf. *Brigittæ* († 1373), Revelationum lib. IV., c. 139-143, ed. et recogn. *Joan de Turrecremata*, Rom., 1488, 1521. Life of St. Bridget of Sweden, by a Sister of the Perpetual Adoration, Mentz, 1875. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *Vita St. Catharinæ*, by her confessor, *Raymundus Capuanus*, P. III., c. 8. (*Bolland.*, Acta SS. m. April, T. III., p. 956 sq.) *Chavin de Malan*, Biography of St. Catharine of Siena, transl. from the Fr. into Germ., Ratisbon, 1847 (declamatory, and glorifying the popedom of Avignon). *Alfonso Capecelatro*, Life of St. Catharine, 2nd ed., Florence, 1859. Le lettere di Sta. Caterina dà Siena con prœmio e Note di *Nic. Tommaseo*, Firenze, 1860 (the Notes have often a young Italian colouring). *Hase*, Caterina of Siena, being the picture of a saint, 1864 (the composition is of a Protestant rationalistic cast, but the colouring is brilliant).

the popular fury.[1] Negotiations were broken off by the death of Gregory, the last of the French Popes, but were shortly resumed and brought to a successful termination.

The popes of Avignon completed the codification of canon law.[2] The last authentic collection (*Lib. V. Clementinarum*) comprising the canons of the Council of Vienne and some others, was compiled under *Clement V.* The constitutions, which made their appearance later on, formed a separate collection, under the title of *Extravagantes* (*Extravagantes Joannis XXII.*, divided into fourteen titles, and seventy-four *Extravagantes communes*, arranged in five books).[3] These were subsequently incorporated into the *Corpus juris* of *John Chapuis* (Paris, 1499).[4]

Unfortunately for the Holy See, its loss of independence and its subordination to French influence, to the exclusion and detriment of other nations, weakened the confidence that had heretofore been reposed in the Head of the Church. Again, the great number of burdensome and arbitrary levies, known as *reservations*, *commends*, *annats* (*fructus medii temporis*, *primi anni*), confirmation fees, and contributions for carrying on the Crusades, which now had assumed the proportions of a *tithe*; and the repulsive picture, drawn by *Petrarca*, an eye-witness, of the scandals of Avignon, to which the fullest credence was given by *Villani*, the Florentine statesman, and *Antoninus*, also a Florentine, largely contributed to destroy respect for the papacy and to weaken the authority of the Holy See. The efforts of Benedict XII., Innocent VI., and Urban V., were ineffectual to counteract the influence of these wide-spread disorders. Relaxation and dissoluteness infected every member of the Church, from the highest to the lowest; stem and branch languished, barren and dishonoured.

B.—GREAT WESTERN SCHISM (A.D. 1378-1417 AND 1439-1449)—POPES AT ROME AND AT AVIGNON—REFORMATORY SYNODS OF PISA, CONSTANCE, AND BASLE.

I. DOCUMENTS: In *Raynald.*, *Baluz.*, *Bulæi*, Hist. Univ. Paris, T. IV.; *d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 763 sq.; *Martène* et *Durand*, Thesaur. nov. anecdotor., T. II., p. 1073; *Eorundem*, Vett. Scriptor. Collectio ampliss., T. VII., p. 425 sq.; *Theodoricus de Niem* (Abbreviator of the Roman Pontiffs, 1378-1410, † Archbishop of Cambrai, 1417), De schism. inter Papas et Antip. (to 1410), libb. III., continued under the title "Nemus unionis," Bas., 1560 f.; Argentor., 1608 and 1629, 8vo.

II. WORKS: *Du Puys*, Hist. du schisme 1378-1428, Par., 1654 and oftener. *Maimbourg*, Hist. du grand schisme d'Occident, Par., 1678, 4to; German, 1792. Præfatio and *Martène* et *Durand*, Ampliss. coll., T. VII. *Christophe*, L. c., T. III. †**Schwab*, John *Gerson*, Professor of Theology and Chancellor of the University of Paris, Würzburg, 1858. **Hefele*, On the Origin of the Great Western Schism in the fourteenth century (Suppl. to Ch. Hist., Vol. I., p. 326, sq., and Hist. of Coun., Vol. VI., p. 628 sq.)

§ 269. *Urban VI.* (A. D. 1378-1389)—*Boniface IX.* (A. D. 1389-1404)—*Innocent VII.* (A. D. 1404-1406)—*Gregory XII.* (A. D. 1406-1409).

The Romans, warned by the disastrous events of preceding pontificates, and apprehensive that another Pope in the interest of France might succeed to Gregory XI., earnestly insisted at the conclave, that in any event an Italian, and, if possible, a Roman, should be chosen to fill the papal throne. The cardinals, after having paid the last tribute of respect to the remains of the late Pope, immediately pro-

[1] *Bolland.*, L. c., p. 957. [2] See § 227.

[3] Cf. *Bickell*, On the origin and actual use of the *Extravagantes* in the Corpus juris canonici, Marburg, 1825. See *Walter*, Text-Book of Canon. Law, 13th ed., p. 205 sq., and *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. IV., p. 373 sq.

[4] Cf. *Maassen*, Sources and Works of Canon Law, Vol. II.

ceeded to the election of his successor. Bartholomew of Prignano, the well-known and highly-esteemed Archbishop of Bari, in Apulia, received the unanimous vote of the conclave. This prelate, who had already acquired name and distinction by the ability with which he managed the Roman chancery under Gregory XI., after the adjustment of a misunderstanding arising out of a confusion of his name with that of the Frenchman, Jean de Barre, ascended the throne of St. Peter, under the name of *Urban VI.* He was crowned in the presence of the College of Cardinals, of princes, lords, and people, and not a single voice was raised to question the legality of his election.

We are informed by Theodoric of Niem, a writer *whose testimony will not be questioned*, that Urban, assured of the love of his people, provoked the cardinals to opposition by the harshness of his language, and needlessly offended many of the secular princes. Hence, the French cardinals, giving as an excuse for their conduct their inability to endure the excessive heat of a Roman summer, withdrew to Anagni, and from this place opened communication with Urban. They sent him a petition, in which they required that he should give up the pontifical tiara and the other insignia of his office, and resign the papal dignity, advancing, as a reason for this strange demand, that his election in the Vatican, at Rome, had not been free. If such was really the case, then they contradict themselves; for in their report of the election, forwarded to the cardinals who had remained behind at Avignon, they had asserted quite the contrary. Their words were as follows: On the Feast of Pentecost, "at the very same hour when the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles, we, *acting undoubtedly under the guidance of the same Spirit*, by a free and unanimous vote, chose the Archbishop of Bari, a man of great virtue and merit."[1] Unfortunately, Urban, with characteristic obstinacy, rejected the advice of *St. Catharine* of *Siena*, who, solicitous for the welfare of the Church, had counselled him to fill the College of Cardinals with men who by their talents and virtue would be worthy of so great a dignity. The imprudent conduct of the Pope gave offence to many, and even those best disposed were gradually alienated from him.

The three Italian cardinals whom he sent to effect a reconciliation with the thirteen French cardinals who had fled the city, were by the latter artfully persuaded to participate in the conclave at *Fondi*, whither those who had remained behind at Avignon had already repaired.

A promise of election had been given to each of the Italian cardinals

[1] It does not appear that external influence and *freedom* of election were, under the circumstances, incompatible. Prima Vita Greg. XI., in *Baluzii* PP. Aven., T. I., p. 442, and Secunda Vita ejusd., ibid., p. 456; *Theodor. de Niem*, in the territory of Paderborn; De Schismate, lib. I., c. 2; *Gobelinus Persona*, Cosmodrom, act. VI., p. 298; *Raynald.* ad an. 1378, nro. 2 sq. The freedom of election, the special object of attack, was ably vindicated by the first jurists of that age, such as *Joannes de Lignano* and *Jacobus de Sera*, doctors of Bologna, and *Baldus*, professor at Perugia. St. Catharine of Sweden, daughter of St. Bridget, then residing at Rome, and an eye-witness of events, testified, according to the declaration of many of the cardinals, that the election was entirely free and lawful.

as the reward of his treachery, and the three of them were not a little amazed when the election of Cardinal Robert, Count of Geneva, Cardinal-priest of the church of the Twelve Apostles, was announced. He took the name of *Clement VII.* (A.D. 1378-1394.) Clement, not feeling secure on Italian soil, retired to Avignon, and it was not long before French diplomacy had secured for him the obedience of Naples and Savoy, Castile, Aragon, and Navarre, and Scotland and Lorraine. The Catholic world, thus distracted, knew not to which of the two claimants to papal authority to yield obedience.

Urban, at length convinced of the necessity of the measure, resolved to create a new College of Cardinals for himself, which should include twenty-nine bishops selected from the churchmen of different nations. He also passed sentence of excommunication upon the French cardinals and their adherents, and applied himself to the work of establishing order at Rome. Through the efforts of St. Catharine of Siena, who laboured assiduously in his cause, many states and cities were induced to pass over to his obedience.

Clement VII., on the other hand, by his cruel system of extortion, punished France for her complicity in his election and the maintenance of his authority, while he himself, having wittingly become the tool of French policy, was forced to put up with every sort of insult.,[1]

Joanna, Queen of Naples, who espoused the cause of Clement VII., paid dearly for her devotion. The sufferings which she endured in consequence, and which culminated in her murder, A. D. 1382, are indeed appalling. Though four times married, she left no issue, and her death was the signal for the breaking out of violent quarrels regarding the succession to the throne, in which both Popes participated. Five Roman cardinals, who, as was said, acting under the counsel of the canonist, *Bartolino* of *Piacenza*, aimed at placing Pope Urban under constraint, were by order of the latter apprehended, cruelly tortured, and finally put to death at Genoa. Several other cardinals, warned by the fate of their colleagues, fled to Avignon. Urban had placed Naples under *interdict*, and was preparing to reduce that city to subjection, when he died at Rome, October 15, 1389.

His death did not close the schism. The Roman cardinals at once proceeded to an election, and chose Peter Tomacelli, a Neapolitan, to succeed to Urban. The newly-elected Pope, who took the name of *Boniface IX.*, carried on a systematic traffic in benefices and indulgences for the profit of his relatives. Each of the contending Popes anathematized the other, and, by a strange perversion of law and right, both were content to rest their claims on the recognition of civil governments, and either deemed himself specially fortunate if he secured the support of any of the great institutions of learning. The *University of Paris*, subsequently called the "*Sorbonne*,"[2] was most

[1] *Nicol de Clémangis*, De corrupto ecclesiæ statu, in *von der Hardt*, Conc. Const., T. I., P. III., p. 19.

[2] This name is taken from *Robert of Sorbon*, aulic chaplain of St. Louis, who established one of the sixty-three colleges of the university: "Collegium Sorbonicum ad commune

prominent in its efforts to put an end to the schism.[1] It proposed three courses, any of which might be taken as a basis of settlement,[2] viz., either the voluntary abdication of the two pontiffs; the submitting of the whole question to a tribunal of arbitrators; or, finally, the convocation of an œcumenical council. Clement VII. was so pained by the tenor of the energetic letter addressed to him by the University that he died of a malady brought on by grief and disappointment (September 6, A. D. 1394).

He was succeeded by Peter de Luna, a crafty Spanish cardinal, who took the name of *Benedict XIII.*, and whose election put fresh difficulties in the way of closing the schism. He had promised, while the election was going forward in the conclave, that, if the choice should fall upon himself, he would employ every means in his power to restore unity to the Church; and that, if it should be found necessary, he would willingly put aside his own claims to bring about so happy an event. But once upon the papal throne, these fair promises were either forgotten or disregarded. Benedict, by his ability and address, succeeded in bringing over to his side *Nicholas de Clémangis*, the ablest representative of the Sorbonne. He also persuaded the famous *Peter d'Ailly* (Petrus ab Alliaco) to accept a bishopric at his hands, and drew to his court *St. Vincent Ferrer*, the Thaumaturgus of that age.

In the meantime, Charles VI., King of France, had summoned the clergy to meet at Paris (A. D. 1395), for the purpose, if possible, of putting an end to the schism. This assembly proposed that the two rival Popes should voluntarily surrender their respective claims. This plan was not acceptable to Benedict, who made every shift to evade complying with it, and even succeeded in persuading the University of Toulouse to espouse his cause. The only effect of his conduct was to make the assembly still more resolute in its demands, and it now sternly insisted upon his abdication. The members of the assembly, fearing that Benedict might pass censures upon them which would

hospitium pauperum scholarium et magistrorum in Theologia studentium." The name of Sorbonne was first applied to the theological faculty only, but at length the whole university received this designation.

[1] The first efforts against the oppression of the Church date from 1381. Cf. *Bulæi*, Hist. Univ. Paris., T. IV., p. 582 sq. In the same year, however, appeared the work of *Henry of Langenstein* or *de Hassia* (vice-chancellor of the University of Paris, and professor of theology at Vienna from 1384.) This work is entitled "Concilium pacis: De unione ac reformatione eccles. *in concilio universali* quærenda." (*Gerson.*, Opp. ed. *du Pin*, T. II., p. 809-840. *Von der Hardt*, Conc. Constant., T. II., P. I., p. 2-61.) The author already holds that, in case of schism, a General Council may assemble *without being either convoked or presided over by the Pope.* It is especially in his answers to the objections (c. 12-15) that he strives to establish his arguments in favour of this thesis.

[2] The opinion given on the 6th of June, and found in *Bulæi*, Hist. Univ. Paris., T. IV., p. 687 sq., and in *d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 776. Cf. *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1389, nro. 14; ad an. 1390, nro. 8, proposed *three* ways of restoring peace to the Church, *namely*, 1. By "cessio;" 2. By "compromissio;" and, 3. By a "concilium generale aut secundum formam juris ex Prælatis tantummodo celebrandum, aut quia plures eorum satis, proh pudor! hodie illiterati sunt, pluresque ad alterutram partem inordinate affecti, *mixtis una cum Prælatis ad æqualem eorum numerum Magistris et Doctoribus theologiæ ac juris* de studiis solemnibus utriusque partium antiquitus approbatis."

either embarrass or render their work abortive, appealed "from him to the future, true, and orthodox Pope of the Universal Church." *Gerson* at this juncture took upon him the office of mediator, and endeavoured to stay the proceedings of the assembly by pointing out to it the dangerous precedent which their proposed line of action would set up; but, notwithstanding his protests, the assembled prelates and deputies of the universities favoured a withdrawal of all obedience from Benedict till he should consent to abdicate. This measure had also its influence upon the obedience given to *Boniface;* for when King *Wenceslaus*, notwithstanding that he had been warned against so doing by the more prudent and far-seeing Rupert of the Palatinate, adopted the policy of the French King, requiring that both Popes should abdicate, Boniface, in his turn, taking advantage of the discontent which existed against Wenceslaus in Germany, set up Rupert as king (A. D. 1400), and thus the schism, which had existed only in the Church was carried into the empire also.[1] Owing to the political troubles and discords of kings and nations, the two obediences continued to exist longer than would otherwise have been the case.

Gerson again attempted—notably in his work entitled the "*Trialogus*"—to reconcile differences and unite the two obediences. "It is," he exclaims, "a sad day when passion usurps the place of truth, and heresy stalks abroad." He also spoke out his mind with noble independence, in an address which he delivered at Tarascon, on New Year's Day, A. D. 1404, in the presence of Benedict, in the course of which he said that abdication, inasmuch as it was, if not the only, the most speedy way of securing peace, became the plain duty of the parties concerned. Benedict, fearing that public opinion might set in against him and wishing to save appearances, opened communication with Boniface; but before anything came of this attempt, the latter died (October 1, A. D. 1404).

But the cardinals, who had been sent to Rome by the antipope to assist in bringing about peace, having stated that their master had no thought of abdicating, the Roman cardinals, after having singly pledged themselves by oath[2] that he upon whom the choice should fall would do all in his power, and even abdicate, if necessary, to close the existing schism, at once proceeded to an election. The choice was hastily made, because of the clamours of the seditious populace, and fell upon Cardinal Meliorato, who took the name of *Innocent VII.* Notwithstanding that he was a man of exemplary piety, he was everywhere represented by the antipope, who was then travelling about in Italy, as the cause of the continuance of the schism. Worn out by the rebellious spirit of the fickle Roman populace, and deceived by the treacherous assistance of Ladislaus, he withdrew to Viterbo. He afterwards returned to his capital, where he died, November 5, A. D. 1406.

[1] **Hœfler*, Rupert of the Palatinate, called Clem, King of the Romans (1400-1410), Freiburg, 1861.

[2] *Theodor. de Niem*, De schism, lib. II., c. 34.

He was succeeded by Cardinal Angelo Corrario, who took the name of *Gregory XII.* Gregory had given the most solemn promises that, in the event of his election, he would make every sacrifice to bring about the peace of the Church, and that, if it should be thought expedient, he would even resign the papal dignity. Notwithstanding all this, the shuffling and double-dealing of the two pontiffs, relative to a proposed conference appointed to be held at *Savona* for the settlement of difficulties, surpassed anything that had heretofore taken place, and forms one of the most disgraceful episodes in the history of the Church. The proposals of the one were rejected by the other. The one preferred a town on the seaboard, the other an inland town. It almost seemed that they had entered into a secret compact to trifle with the agonized feelings of Christendom. It was sneeringly said "that Gregory, being a landsman, could not bear the sight of water; and his opponent, being of an aquatic turn, had a wholesome dread of land." France now refused obedience to Benedict, and the Roman cardinals fell from the side of Gregory. Thus disengaged, both parties, at a conference held at Leghorn, agreed to meet at *Pisa*, in March, A. D. 1409, and hold an *Œcumenical Council* for the purpose of putting an end to these disastrous dissensions.

It is evident, from the letters of convocation, that its framers did not fully seize the question at issue, nor grasp the principle of its solution. It contained the germ which might, as *Gregory XII.* clearly pointed out in his protest, bear dangerous fruit in the future. He said "that judgment had been given though there had been no judge, and that the council had been convoked only to ratify the verdict which the cardinals had already rendered." He further maintained that since the right of convoking an œcumenical council was the exclusive prerogative of the Pope, and that since he was both willing and prepared to convoke and hold a council, provided only the choice of the place of holding it should be left to two persons selected by himself and the cardinals, he could not consent to recognize the Council of Pisa, without at the same time degrading the pontifical authority, and setting up a precedent which would be fraught with danger to future generations, and would imperil the safety of that See on whose stability depended the welfare of the Church. The attitude of hostility assumed by the Popes later on, in relation to their cardinals, tended to complicate affairs still further. *D'Ailly* and *Gerson* laboured,[1] ineffectually, however, to defend and justify the action of the Council of Pisa in assembling *without having been convoked and participated in by the Pope.*

Gerson took the novel ground, that, in the case of a conflict be-

[1] *Petr. de Alliaco*, Aliquæ propositiones utiles ad extinctionem schismatis præsentis per viam Conc. general. (*Gerson*, Opp., T. II., p. 112 sq., and *Martène*, Coll., T. VII., p. 905 sq.) *Gerson*, Tractatus de unitate ecclesiastica (Opp. ed. *du Pin*, T. II., p. 114 sq.; Commonitorium, T. II., p. 121 sq., and the address to the English embassy in Paris, ibid., p. 123-130. Cf. *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 172-186). *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 791 sq.

tween two rivals, each claiming and having apparently an equal right to the same dignity, the fairest and most efficient way of doing justice between them would be to put both claimants aside and set up a third in their place. No harm, he said, would come to the *unity of the Church* from such a proceeding. This would be preserved by the bond existing between the visible Church and Christ, her Invisible Head. The Church, in such a hypothesis, having no visible Head, either because the Pope was politically or corporally dead, or because the faithful had refused to recognise him, might proceed to supply this trifling defect and give herself a new Head by means of a council convoked by the cardinals. It is quite evident from what has been said, that very serious doubts were entertained as to the œcumenical character of the Council of Pisa, even prior to its opening.[1]

§ 270. *Council of Pisa* (*March* 25 *to August* 7, A. D. 1409)—*Alexander V.* (A. D. 1409-1410)—*John XXIII.* (A. D. 1410-1417).

I. Varia Acta conc. Pisani et ad illud spectantia (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., p. 803-862), in *Mansi*, T. XXVI., p. 1131 sq., and T. XXVII., p. 1-522. *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 1929-1962; T. VIII., p. 1-204. *Theodor. de Niem*, Tract. de schism. III., 38 sq.

II. *Lenfant*, Hist. du concile de Pise, Amst., 1724-27, II. T., 4to. † *Richerii*, Hist. concilior general., lib. II., c. 2, T. II., p. 64-131. † *Von Wessenberg*, The Great Councils of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Constance, 1840, 4 vols.), T. II., p. 48-69. To rectify the partiality of this author, see *Hefele*, Critical Examination of Wessenberg, in the Tübingen Quarterly Review, 1841, nro. 4, and especially "*The Catholic*," 1840, November number. †*Schwab*, John Gerson, p. 229 sq. **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 863 sq.

The opening of the Council of Pisa was a very imposing and brilliant affair. The Sacred College was represented by twenty-two cardinals of both obediences—the episcopate by four titulary patriarchs, ten archbishops, and sixty-nine bishops, who came in person, and by the procurators of one hundred and two archbishops and bishops; the priesthood by eighty-seven abbots, personally present, and by the proxies of two hundred others, by forty-one priors, and the generals of four Mendicant Orders. There were also present the grand master and sixteen commanders of the Knights of St. John, the prior-general of the Holy Sepulchre, the procurator-general of the Teutonic Order, and the representatives of one hundred and nine cathedrals and collegiate chapters; the ambassadors of princes and the deputies of thirteen universities;[2] one hundred and twenty-three doctors of theology, and nearly two hundred doctors and licentiates

[1] The doubt gained strength when the main affair of the Council of Pisa, the election of Alexander V., was disavowed by the deposition of his successor, John XXIII. Hence the council was styled in *Antonini* Summa historialis, Tit. XXII., c. 5, § 3: "*Conciliabulum*, cum non esset auctoritate alicujus eorum, qui se gerebant pro Pontifice, congregatum et per idem non erat ablatum schisma, sed augmentatum." *Bellarminus*, De conciliis et ecclesia, lib. I., c. 8, calls it: "Nec approbatum, nec reprobatum." Also, *Ballerinus*, De Potest. eccl. summor. Pontif. et. conc. general., c. 6, denies its œcumenical character. The Gallicans alone are of a contrary opinion, and consider the Council of Constance a sequel to that of Pisa.

[2] *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 854 sq. (Tr.)

of canon and civil law; the ambassadors of almost every king, prince, and republic of the West. Science, the priesthood, and the State were therefore well represented.[1]

The first session of the council was opened on the feast of the Annunciation, March 25, A. D. 1409, under the presidency of *Guido de Malesec*, the senior cardinal.

The council, after having listened to the arguments of its two most distinguished and learned representatives, *Peter d'Ailly*, who had been made Bishop of Cambrai in 1398, and *Peter d'Anchorano*, a jurisconsult of Bologna, together with some others, declared, in its eighth and ninth sessions, that it had been *canonically convoked* and *truly represented the whole Church*. In the twelfth session it set aside the protest of the two Popes, and of Rupert, King of Germany, and Ladislaus, King of Naples, both of whom had espoused the cause of Gregory XII. and renounced all obligation of obedience to either of the rival pontiffs. The Patriarch of Alexandria publicly read the following decree: "Whereas the shameless misconduct and excesses of both claimants are notorious, and whereas scandal is imminent and delay may be dangerous, immediate action shall be taken against them." In the *fifteenth* session (June 5, 1409), both were pronounced obstinate, declared to have perjured themselves, and were cut off from the Church as hopelessly heretical (?) and schismatical. It was further enacted that the See of Rome was vacant, and that the body of the faithful and emperors and kings were absolved from all allegiance to either of the claimants.

All doubts touching the validity of this sentence, if any such existed in the minds of the Fathers, were satisfactorily cleared up by the arguments of the French theologians present at the council, and by those contained in the work of *Gerson*, "On the separation of the Pope from the Church."[2] Gerson argued, in the work just alluded to, that there were certain cases in which the Pope might be legally deposed; for, as he went on to prove, starting with the Aristotelian principle of government, the Church, like every other society in the enjoyment of its freedom, has a clear right to rid herself of a prince when once she is convinced that he has become hopelessly incorrigible. It would seem that this line of reasoning was perfectly satisfactory to the council.

In the sixteenth session the cardinals entered into a solemn engagement, by which each bound himself that, in case the choice should fall upon him at the approaching election, he would not dissolve the council until it had provided for a thorough *reformation of the Church in both Head and members*.[3]

[1] It is hardly possible to give the exact number of the members, on account of different statements. *Mansi* probably presents the most complete enumeration, in his T. XXVI., pp. 1136, 1184, and T. XXVII., p. 331 sq.—*Harduin*, T. VIII., pp. 5, 46.

[2] Libellus de auferibilitate Papæ ab ecclesia, according to Matt. ix. 15: Veniet dies cum auferetur ab eis sponsus (*Gerson*, Opp., T. II., pp. 209-224); see *Schwab*, p. 250 sq.

[3] Conf. *Raynald.*, Ad a. 1409, nro. 71: "Cardinales sacramento se obstrinxere singuli, si ad Pontificalis dignitatis fastigium eveherentur, concilium propagaturos, donec de eccle-

The question now came up as to whether the right of electing a Pope appertained to the whole council or to the cardinals exclusively. After a lengthy discussion the latter opinion was adopted. The cardinals of both obediences, now twenty-four in number, went into conclave on the 15th of June, and in the nineteenth session, on the 26th of the same month, elected Cardinal Peter Philargi of Candia, who took the name of *Alexander V.* He was a member of the Order of Friars Minor, had written a work of some merit on the Liber Sententiarum of Peter Lombard, and enjoyed a high reputation as a theologian and preacher. His moral character was above suspicion, and his habits austere. Wealthy as the Bishop of Milan, but poor as a cardinal, he was reduced to absolute want by his imprudent habits of extravagance after he had become Pope. That he had the best intentions, there can be no doubt, but it is also equally true that he was the serviceable tool of the shrewd and designing *Cossa, Cardinal Legate* of Bologna.

The notorious speech said to have been delivered at the Council of Pisa by Gerson (who was not present there at all), and addressed to Alexander V., was only an open letter to that Pope, by which the writer sought to secure him to the reform movement, and in this way furnish a basis of a reunion and an enduring peace between the Eastern and Western Churches.

The council held very few sessions after the election of Alexander; but during these, the Pope, taking into consideration the motions of the French, English, German, and Polish bishops, remitted the payment of all arrears due to the papal treasury, relinquished the revenues of the vacant bishoprics (fructus medii temporis), and ordered the holding of *provincial and diocesan synods* and *general chapters* of religious Orders.

The council finally broke up, in its twenty-third session, August 7th, *without* having done anything towards effecting that *reformation* of the Church, in her head and members, which had been so much spoken of and deemed of such vital importance. The Fathers did not, however, entirely give up the subject. Before separating they *unanimously agreed* that they would again come together within the course of three years and take up the subject afresh.[1] The character of these zealous reformers seems to warrant the suspicion that there may have been *very substantial* reasons for this delay. Indeed, no one seemed to know precisely how to go about furnishing a remedy for the existing and deplorable evils. It was, moreover, of the greatest importance, before proceeding further, to have the newly-elected Pope universally recognized. Unfortunately, Spain, Portugal, and Scotland

siastica disciplina restituenda leges conditæ forent," etc. *Gerson* forcibly represented to Pope Alexander V., previously to his coronation, the necessity of this reform. Sermo factus coram Alex. P. in die Ascens. Domini. (*Gerson*, Opp., T. II., pp. 131-141; *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 413 sq.)

[1] The acts of the council say expressly, and the Pope repeats: "Decernimus, *sacro approbante Concilio, sacro requirente et approbante Concilio*—iterum generale Concilium eccl. fore convocandum hinc ad triennium," etc.

remained loyal to Benedict, while Ladislaus of Naples, and several of the minor Italian States, were equally firm in their allegiance to Gregory. As the far-seeing Rupert, King of Germany, had predicted, Europe saw to her dismay and pain that she was now obliged to make choice between *three*, instead of two *claimants to the papal throne.* The evil effects which followed the council are chiefly to be attributed to kings and princes, who, instead of following the example of the Fathers of the Council of Pisa, and meeting the wishes of the Christian world, did more, by the selfish policy which they pursued, to inflame, than to allay the passions which the schism had called into play.

Alexander, fearing to take up his residence at Rome, withdrew to Bologna, where he died, May 3, A. D. 1410.

Cardinal *Cossa*, notwithstanding that rumours were abroad of his having dealt foully with Alexander, was elected successor to the latter, and took the name of *John XXIII.*

Theodoric of Niem gives a frightful, but probably exaggerated account of the wickedness of his life, the depravity of his morals, and the violence of his conduct. The Florentine historian, *Bartolomei Valori*, and the monk of St. Denys represent him in a more favourable light.[1] He confirmed all the ordinances of his predecessor, and the acts of the Council of Pisa; announced his own election to churches and princes, and called upon all to aid him in getting rid of the anti-popes. In matter of fact, John was recognized by the great majority of Catholic nations. He persuaded the electors of the German Empire, to which, now that Rupert was dead, there were three claimants, as well as to the papacy, to give their votes to *Sigismund* of Luxemburg, and forced Ladislaus of Naples to renounce his allegiance to Gregory.

It was smooth sailing for John, as long as he did not touch the pockets of his subjects; but no sooner had he exacted the tithes of all benefices, the revenues of vacant churches, and the property of deceased ecclesiastics, than the Sorbonne and the Parliament of France entered their protests against these and similar pretensions.

In April, A. D. 1412, the Pope, to preserve appearances, opened *at Rome* the council which had been agreed upon at Pisa for the reformation of the Church in her Head and members.[2] Quite a small number of bishops put in an appearance, who, after having condemned the antipopes, and some heretical propositions of *Wycliffe* and *John Huss*, hastily adjourned. John, who does not seem to have had any very earnest wish to correct his own life, and who, consequently, could not be expected to be over solicitous about the correction of those of others, was carefully provident to prevent the bishops coming to Rome in excessive numbers. He had come to a secret understanding with Ladislaus, his former enemy, that the latter should have all the roads well guarded. Ladislaus, soon turned against the Pope, and forced him

[1] Cf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VII., p. 10 sq.
[2] Cf *Mansi*, T. XXVII., pp. 505-507. *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 203.

to quit Rome, and seek refuge, first at Florence, and next at Bologna (A. D. 1413). From this city John opened communications with the princes of Europe with the purpose of fixing a place for holding the council. Ladislaus having suddenly died, his successor, the Emperor Sigismund, appointed the city of Constance, where the council did, in fact, convene, November 1, A. D. 1414. Works were now published in anticipation of the Council, in which the necessity of speedily providing efficient means for the removal of existing evils was strongly urged upon the Fathers.[1]

§ 271. *The Council of Constance* (A. D. 1414-1418)

Herman v. d. Hardt, Magnum œcumen. concil. Constant., Frcf. et Lps., 1697-1700, 6 vols. f.; also in *Mansi*, T. XXVII., XXVIII., and *Harduin*, T. VIII. *Theodorici Vrie* (Augustinian Friar of Osnabrück, eye-witness), De Consolatione Eccl., being an Historia concilii Constant, in *v. d. Hardt*, T. I., P. I. *Ulrich von Richenthal* of Constance, an eye-witness, wrote, Council of Constance, Augsburg, 1483, 1536, in fol. and oftener. *John Stumpff* (author of the Swiss Chronicle), Short account of the great General Council of Constance, Zürich, 1550, 4to. *Marmor*, Hist. of the Council of Constance, according to Ulrich of Richenthal, Constance, 1860. *Döllinger*, Materials for a history of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, 1863, Vol. II. *Bourgeois du Chastenet*, Nouvelle Hist. du concile de Constance, Par., 1718, 4to. (mostly documents). *Theod. de Niem*, Invectiva in diffugientem a Const. Conc. Joan. XXIII., in *v. d. Hardt*, T. II., P. XIV. and XV., pp. 296-830. *Ejusdem*, Vita Joan. XXIII., ibid., pp. 336-460. *Lenfant*, Hist. du concile de Constance, ed. II., Amsterd., 1727, 2 vols. 4to. †*Tosti*, Storia del Concilio di Costanza, Napoli, 1853, 2 T., 4to, Germ. by *Arnold*, Schaffhausen, 1860. *Natal. Alex.*, H. e. sæc. XV., diss. III.-VII. †*Emmanuel Schelstrate*, Compend. chronol. rer. ad decreta Const. spect., at the head of his treatise, De sensu et auctoritate decretor. Const. conc., Rom., 1686, 4to. †*Richerii* Hist. Concilior. gener., lib. II., c. 3, T. II., pp. 131-270. †*Royko*, Hist. of the Synod of Constance, Vienna and Prague, 1782 sq., 4 vols. (a prolix, narrow-minded, and very partial work.) †*Wessenberg*, The Great Councils, Vol. II., pp. 69-267. Cf. *Hefele*, L. c., and *The Catholic*, 1841, *Jan., Febr.*, July, Aug., and Sept. numbers. **Schwab*, John Gerson, pp. 497-527. †*Aschbach*, Life of Emperor Sigismund, Frankfort (1838-45, 4 vols.), Vol. II., p. 69 sq. *Hübler*, The Constance Reformation, Lps., 1867. **Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VII., Pt. I.

The abuses which prevailed generally throughout the Church, and which were considerably increased by the existence of *three* rival Popes, and by the various theories on Church government called forth by the controversy, greatly perplexed men's minds, and created much anxiety as to the direction affairs might eventually take. This unsettled state of feeling accounts for the unusually large number of ecclesiastics who attended the council. There were eighteen thousand ecclesiastics of all ranks, of whom, when the number was largest, three were patriarchs, twenty-four cardinals, thirty-three archbishops, close upon one hundred and fifty bishops, one hundred and twenty-four abbots, fifty provosts, and three hundred doctors in the various degrees.

[1] Among these must be reckoned Tractatus de modis uniendi ac reformandi ecclesiam in Concilio Universali (A. D. 1410), ad *Petrum de Alliaco*, Cardinal. Cameracens. (Opp., ed. *du Pin*, T. II., p. 161 sq.; *v. d. Hardt*, T. I., P. V., p. 67 sq.), ever since the times of *von der Hardt* attributed to Gerson; so likewise the treatises de difficultate reformationis eccles. and de necessitate reformat. eccles. (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., P. V., pp. 255-269; T. I., P. VII., pp. 277-398; and *Gerson*, Opp., T. II., p. 867 sq., and pp. 885-902), which used to be fathered upon *Peter d'Ailly*. These works, after the profound investigations of *Schwab* (John Gerson, pp. 470-492), draw their origin not from the men just mentioned, but from *Andrew of Randuf*, professor and Benedictine abbot, and *Theodoric de Niem*.

Many princes attended in person. There were constantly one hundred thousand strangers in the city, and, on one occasion, as many as one hundred and fifty thousand, among whom were many of a disreputable character. Feeling ran so high that, as might have been anticipated, every measure was extreme.

Owing to the peculiar composition of the Council, at which only a limited number of bishops were present, and these chiefly in the interest of John XXIII., it was determined to decide all questions, not by a majority of episcopal suffrages, but by that of the representatives of the various nations, including doctors. The work about to engage the Council was of a threefold character, viz., 1. *To terminate the papal schism*; 2. *To condemn errors against faith, and particularly those of Huss;* and 3. *To enact reformatory decrees* (*intendimus insistere pacem, exaltationem et reformationem ecclesiæ et tranquillitatem populi Christiani*).

It was with some difficulty that *John* could be induced to attend at Constance, and when he did finally consent, it was only because he was forced to take the step by the representations of others. On his way through Switzerland his habit of swearing by the devil gave great offence to the simple-minded people of that country. When in sight of Constance, he remarked to his attendants: "Yonder is the trap in which foxes are taken." The day set for the opening of the Council was November 1st, and John arrived the 27th of October previous. Regarding the Council as a continuation of that of Pisa, he naturally thought that he would be recognized as the legitimate successor of the Pope chosen by the latter.

The Council opened November 5th, with all the splendour and magnificence John was so fond of displaying on great solemnities. At the *first general Session* held in the cathedral John delivered an address, exhorting the members to give their best energies and most mature consideration to whatever measures might serve to secure the peace of the Church. The officers of the different nations, viz., *Italian*, *French*, *German*, and *English* (the Spanish representatives of "Pope Benedict XIII." did not arrive till later), were next appointed.

The Emperor Sigismund, who arrived at Constance on Christmas Eve, was received by the Pope in the cathedral, which was brilliantly illuminated for the occasion, after which vested, according to ancient custom, in deacon's dalmatic, he read the Gospel at the High Mass celebrated by the Pope.

At the general congregations, held in January, 1415, the admissibility of the representatives to be sent by Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. was discussed; and two memorials read, one from the Germans, and the other from the French Cardinal *Filastre*, of the title of St. Mark, demanding that a *judicial* and *definitive voice* (*vox judicativa et definitiva*) should not be confined to bishops and mitred abbots, but should be extended to the proxies of bishops, to abbots, chapters, and universities, and to masters, doctors, and the ambassadors of princes; for, it was urged, doctors enjoyed a definitive voice at the Councils of

Pisa (1409) and Rome (1412). As a means of restoring union, Filastre proposed that the *three claimants should simultaneously abdicate*, and a new pope be elected, and that this election should be decisive and recognized by all.

To both these propositions John XXIII. and his adherents offered a most vigorous resistance; and d'Ailly, in consequence, wrote a treatise, the drift of which was to show that the older councils had been of various composition, and that it was entirely wrong to allow a titular bishop, without a soul under his charge, to enjoy equal rights and influence with, say, the Archbishop of Mentz. He therefore demanded that particular doctors of divinity and laws, out of consideration for their offices of teachers and preachers, should be permitted a definitive voice. This treatise was supplemented by another, and more aggressive one, from the pen of Filastre, and through their efforts the measure was finally carried. It was, moreover, determined, on February 7th, that the vote should be taken, not by numerical representation, but *by nations*, each being entitled to only one ballot.

All questions were first discussed by the various nations, each member of which had the right to vote. Their decision was next brought before a general conference of nations, and this result again before the next session of the Council. This plan of organisation destroyed the hopes of John XXIII., who relied for success on the preponderance of Italian prelates and doctors, who constituted, numerically, about one-half the qualified voters.

After the division of the Council into the above-named four nations, the Poles being included among the Germans, deputies, both clerical and lay, were nominated, and proctors and notaries appointed. Each nation was presided over by a president, who was changed every month.

To intimidate John, and subdue his resistance, a memorial, written probably by an Italian, was put in circulation, containing charges the most damaging to that pontiff's private character, and asserting that where guilt was so notorious, any investigation into the truth and accuracy of the charges was wholly unnecessary. And so timely and effective was this blow, that John was thenceforth utterly destitute of the energy and consideration necessary to support his authority, or direct the affairs of the Council. He, in consequence, commissioned the highly esteemed Cardinal Zabarella to declare in the general congregation, held February 16th, that, in order to give peace to the Church, he would abdicate, provided Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. would also resign. But the proposal was hedged about with other clauses which might be so interpreted as to leave his abdication entirely to his own pleasure. Owing to the still more hostile attitude of the Council towards him after the arrival of the deputies of the University of Paris, headed by Gerson, February 18, John, in the *second general session*, held March 2, formally promised under oath, that in case the other two claimants would resign their pretensions, he would do the same After this arrangement had been agreed to

by the Council, the emperor, the cardinals, and the whole body broke out in expressions of thanksgiving. The emperor was about to set out to Nizza, to induce the other claimants to resign, when John took exception to his course, and particularly objected to the plenipotentiaries appointed by the Council to represent himself. The suspicion at once gained ground, that John, with the assistance of *Frederic*, Duke of Austria and Count of Tyrol, intended to make good his escape from the Council. The latter disclaimed being an accomplice to this project, and John promised under oath "not to depart from the city before the Council had dissolved." But, notwithstanding these protestations, John escaped (March 21, 1415), disguised as a groom, during a great tournament arranged by the duke, and made his way to Schaffhausen, belonging to the latter, thence to Laufenburg and Freiburg, thence again to the fortress of Brisac, whence he had intended to pass to Burgundy, and on to Avignon.

That the Council went on with its work after the departure of John, and amid the general perplexity and confusion, was entirely due to the resolution of the emperor, the eloquence of *Gerson*, and the indefatigable efforts of the venerable master, now cardinal, *d'Ailly*.

The following memorable decrees were passed from the third to the fifth general sessions: "*A Pope can neither transfer nor dissolve a general Council without the consent of the latter, and hence the present Council may validly continue its work even after the flight of the Pope. All persons, without distinction of rank, even the Pope himself, are bound by its decisions, in so far as these relate to matters of faith, to the closing of the present schism, and to the reformation of the Church of God in her Head and members.*[1] *All Christians, not excepting the Pope, are under obligation to obey the Council.*"

Even before the close of the Council, Cardinal d'Ailly and Gersor published writings in which they defended its action.[2] The propositions are, *from the very nature of the case*, both inadmissible and incapable of defence; for, in a body full of life and vigour, *each*

[1] The original text of these decrees, as given in the oldest manuscripts, runs as follows: "Hæc Sta Synodus in Spiritu scto congregata legitime, generale concilium faciens, Ecclesiam Catholicam militantem repræsentans; potestatem a Christo immediate habet; cui quilibet cujuscunque dignitatis, etiamsi papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent *ad fidem* et extirpationem dicti schismatis et reformationem generalem ecclesiæ in capite et membris." *Friedrich*, of the Munich Academy of Sciences, Historical Department, in the report of February 4, 1871, proves incorrect the statements of the editor of the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, Rome, 1867-68, and of *Deschamps*, Archbishop of Malines. Infallibility of the Pope and a General Council (Germ.), Mentz, 1869, p. 108 sq. Friedrich also proves that *John Turrecremata*, the Pope's theologian at Basle, in his two controversial works—"*Tractatus notabilis de potestate Papæ et concilii generalis*" and "*De pontificis max conciliique generalis auctoritate*"—quotes and draws out the bearing of the words *ad fidem*, which are wanting in the Hainault edition of the Conc. Const., ann. 1500, and in the reprints of Milan, 1511, and of Paris and Cologne. He also shows that the reading *ad finem* et extirpationem, found in the codex of Cardinal de Bouillon, was unknown to Turrecremata.

[2] *Petrus de Alliaco*, Tractatus de potestate ecclesiastica, in the year 1416 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. VI., p. 15-78; *Gerson*, Opp., T. II.) *Joh. Gerson*, Tract. de potest. eccl., A. D. 1417 (ibid., p. 78-137; Gerson, Opp., T. II., p. 225-260).

member contributes to the general welfare, and if the Church is such, the principles contained in these articles are not applicable to her, nor could her true children have framed them. In matter of fact, the head is neither above nor subordinate to the body. It is *of* the body, and constitutes, *with* it, but *one* organisation. No body can exist without its head, and no head without its body. They are inseparable. The conditions to the existence of a body in the natural order are verified in the case of the Church also, she being a mystical body, of which Christ is the invisible and the Pope the visible Head. The assertion, therefore, contained in the propositions that an œcumenical council is completely independent of the Head of the Church, is destructive of the very fundamental idea of the latter. All Catholics believe, with unquestioning faith, that the Head of the Church possesses the fulness of ecclesiastical authority, and that in order to have an œcumenical council, in the orthodox sense of these words, it is necessary that the Pope shall convoke such council, and essential that he shall preside, either personally or by his legates, and give his approbation to its decrees. Hence the Pope is in some sort *above* an œcumenical council.

But, on the other hand, the circumstances which led to the convening of the Council of Constance were so unprecedented and abnormal that they seemed, for the time being, to give colour to the assumption of independence. The three Popes (it being *uncertain which was the true one*) had really cut themselves off from communion with the Church, had rent asunder her unity, and refused to listen to moderate and just demands. Each of them was equally unwilling to yield any of his claims, to abdicate, or even to submit the question to arbitration.

It seems that the only way out of a difficulty so vast and threatening was to declare and maintain that the Pope was subject to an œcumenical council, and that when guilty of any offence against faith, or of any attempt to prevent the closing of schism, or the general reformation of morals, he might be lawfully deposed by it.

At a still later date, many of the Fathers of Constance asserted that the Pope was above an œcumenical council, and defended the doctrine with ability. And if Gerson afterwards assailed the same doctrine in his public writings, he also conceded that the question did not as yet admit of a definitive solution, and confessed "that nothing but the confused state of opinion consequent upon a season of protracted schism could have brought the council to set aside the doctrine of papal supremacy, which had heretofore been universally accepted."[1]

The great mistake of the theologians of Constance consisted in giving to a line of action, to which they were driven by an abnormal condition of affairs, the force and authority of a *dogmatic principle*.[2]

[1] De potestate eccles. consid. x. et xii.

[2] The words of Cardinal *Serij andi*, addressed to the Gallican *Ferrier* at Trent, are apposite, and make the distinction clear: "Allatum ab illo fundamentum Synodi Con-

That they had not unlimited faith in the theory they advocated is evident from their own admissions. In the discussion concerning the formula drawn up for the *condemnation* of the works of Wycliffe and Huss, the question arose as to whether it should rest on the authority of the Pope, on that of the council, or of both; and of the forty doctors of theology having the matter in hand, and consisting of members of the various universities, twenty-eight refused to accede to the proposition of *d'Ailly*, "to have the condemnation pronounced in the name of the council, without mentioning the Pope;" "because," they said, "the council, of itself, possessed no authority except what it derived from its head (*ex capite*)." Again, *John*, Patriarch of Antioch, one of the Pope's most determined opponents, defended the two following propositions against d'Ailly: 1. The Pope is *not* subordinate to an œcumenical council; 2. The decrees of the present synod must be executed in the name of the Pope.[1]

Pope John, after getting away safe to Schaffhausen, complained formally of the action of the Council towards himself, summoned all the cardinals to appear personally before him within six days, and sent memorials to the King of France, to the Dukes of Orleans, Berry, and Burgundy, and to the University of Paris, justifying his flight. Still the council went on with its work; disposed, after a fashion, of the papal difficulty, and of the cases of Huss and Jerome of Prague. For complicity in the escape of John XXIII., Frederic of Austria was placed by the Emperor Sigismund under ban of the empire and deprived of his estates. In the meantime, Frederic, Margrave of Brandenburg, acting under the joint order of council and emperor, arrested the fugitive Pope at Freiburg, and led him a prisoner to Radolfzell, near Constance, where fifty-four (originally seventy-two) charges—some of them of a most disgraceful character—extracted from the testimony of a host of witnesses, were laid before him by a committee of the council, May 27th. John, seeing that it was useless to attempt to shirk difficulties, resolved to face them and make the best possible terms with his judges. He replied to the committee, that, previously to his elevation to the papacy, he had strenuously laboured to restore union to the Church; had on one occasion, at Constance, offered to resign; was sincerely sorry for whatever faults he might have committed; would not attempt to exculpate himself, but, on the contrary, would submit the charges against him to the judgment of the council, whose decisions he would abide; *believed that the Council of Constance was holy and could not err*, and would take exception neither to its rulings nor to the depositions

stant. haud solidum esse: id temporis *certum Romanum Pontificem non extitisse*, atque hinc ad schisma sedandum opus fuisse, ut declaratio ad synodum pertinerit, adeoque ut illa præsset cunctis illis pontificibus litigiosis. At in præsentia vivere inter Catholicos supremum pontificem: certum, legitimum atque indubitatum, cui universa ecclesia subdebatur." (*Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. XIX., cap. 14, nro. 5). Cf. *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. I., p. 245-264.

[1] Conf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VII., pp. 111, 112

of the witnesses against himself. In the *twelfth session*, held May 29th, John XXIII. was formally and solemnly deposed; and it was further enacted that neither he, Gregory XII., nor Benedict XIII., could be ever again eligible to the papacy. Two days later, John, now called simply Balthasar Cossa, was confined in the castle of Gottlieben, belonging to the Bishop of Constance, where Huss had been lately imprisoned; was thence transferred to the castle of Heidelberg, and finally to Mannheim.

Gregory XII. also consented now to redeem his promise, and accordingly resigned his claims, but not until he had issued a bull convoking the council and recognising its authority. Believing himself to be the only *canonically elected Pope*, he felt that this measure was necessary to legalize his abdication, which took place July 19, A. D. 1415. As a reward for the sacrifice made by him to promote the peace of the Church, and for the conciliatory disposition he exhibited, he was raised to the dignity of Cardinal Legate of Ancona. He died in October, 1417.

The Emperor Sigismund went in person to Perpignan, to confer with *Benedict XIII.*, whom he endeavoured to persuade to renounce his claims to the papacy; but the old man obstinately refused to consent. Even the Spaniards now withdrew from his obedience, and of all who had once recognized him, only the inhabitants of the little town of Peñiscola, in Valencia, remained loyal to him. On the return of the emperor to Constance, the process against Benedict was commenced, and terminated with his deposition in the thirty-seventh session, held July 26, 1417. In the act of deposition he was described as a perjurer, a schismatic, and a heretic; as one who by his conduct had done all in his power to subvert the unity of faith, and the Catholicity of the Church.

The Catholic world took no further notice of him, but he continued to persistently assert his claims, and to declare to the world that the Church had, for the present, sought refuge in the quiet town of Peñiscola, which he compared to the Ark of Noah, and whence, like Noah of old, she would again come forth after the storm had gone by. He died in 1424.

The three claimants to the papacy having been thus disposed of, it now remained to elect a legitimate successor to St. Peter. Previously to proceeding to an election, a decree was passed providing that *in this particular instance, but in no other*, six deputies of each nation should be associated with the cardinals in making the choice.

The conclave consisted of twenty-three cardinals, and thirty deputies, for whom fifty-three cells were prepared at the private residence of a merchant of Constance. On the 11th of November, 1417, the unanimous suffrages of the conclave were given in favour of *Otho Colonna*, a cardinal distinguished for his great learning, his purity of life, and gentleness of disposition. He was ordained deacon, November 12; raised to the priesthood the following day; on the next, which

was Sunday, consecrated bishop; and finally, on Sunday, November 21, anointed and crowned under the name of *Martin V.* The Church had once more a recognized head, order succeeded to confusion, and peace was once more restored to her children.

But it was necessary to make long and persevering efforts to secure these blessings. Sigismund and the German nation, and for a time the English also, insisted that the question of the reformation of the Church, the chief points of which had been sketched in a schema of eighteen articles,[1] should be taken up and disposed of *before* proceeding to the election of a Pope. After some discussion it became evident that the call upon the Council to elect a Pope was paramount to all others—an opinion which was advocated by the more prudent among its members, such as *Peter d'Ailly*, *Gerson*, and Cardinal *Zabarella*, who, in defence of their position, appealed to the words of our Lord: "Every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate, and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand."[2] They also argued, that all experience had taught that any attempt to reform the Church in her Head and members by framing and passing decrees, which might be easily set aside by those for whose correction they were intended, under the plausible pretext that they had been enacted by an assembly destitute of its legitimate Head, would be utterly hopeless.[3] The work which the Council had proposed to accomplish, as already stated, was threefold. As yet only the first part of this triple task, namely, the closing of the schism, had been accomplished.

An attempt had indeed been made by the Fathers to *crush out the heresy of John Huss*, of whom we shall presently have occasion to speak at length; but the attempt, instead of bettering matters, made them worse, and from the date of the heresiarch's arrival at Constance, November 3, A. D. 1414, to the date of his death, July 6 of the following year, he grew daily more obstinately attached to his errors. Even his death became a source of fresh troubles to the Church. Martin, the newly elected Pope, did not fully carry out all the proposed *reforms*. It is true, he appointed a committee composed of *six* cardinals and deputies from each nation, and gave the work into their hands; but their councils were so conflicting that they could neither come to a definite agreement among themselves, nor would they

1 In *von der Hardt*, T. IV., p. 1452, and in *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 1164.

Matt. xii. 25.

3 The protest entered by the cardinals and the three other nations against the Germans, account of their long delay in electing a Pope, is very remarkable. It is dated September, 1417, and the following passage is there read: "*Præterea si reformatio fienda est de deformatis, quæ major est et esse potest in corpore deformitas, quam carere capite et acephalum esse?* Illa igitur prior tanquam magis necessaria debet esse reformatio, quæ corpus ipsum ad caput reformet et *informet*, et contrarium asserere vel facere, non videtur esse securum." Sess. XXXVIII., in *Mansi.*, T. XXVII., p. 1152. *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 849. The German nation had, moreover, from the very outset, openly declared that: "Nec est aut erit assertrix, nec umquam intravit ejus mentem hujusmodi *hæreseos* infectio, ut ecclesiam sine summo Pontifice debite hierarchizari putet, aut utilem esse vacationem diutius protelatam." *Mansi.*, L. c., p. 1155. *Harduin*, p. 852.

consent to adopt the plan of reform submitted by the Pope.[1] The representatives of the several nations, conscious that the temper of the committee was not such as would admit of any arrangement at once satisfactory to each, and adequate to the wants of all, concluded that, under the circumstances, the most efficient way to remedy the terrible evils and correct the flagrant abuses which afflicted the Church, would be for each nation to enter into a separate *concordat* with the Pope.[2] These concordats, interpreted and carried out in the spirit of the reformatory decrees, given below in a footnote, would go far to remove abuses in both Church government and ecclesiastical life.

As a high standard of education and an unexceptional morality among the clergy are essential conditions to the carrying out of any systematic and thoroughgoing ecclesiastical reform, it was quite impossible, under the existing circumstances, to achieve more than partial success in such an undertaking. Even the bishops seemed more intent upon advancing the temporal prosperity of their states, than upon securing the spiritual welfare of the faithful of their dioceses. Notwithstanding the earnest and repeated protests of the Council it was found impossible to at once overthrow the vast fabric of adventitious papal supremacy in political affairs, acquired gradually in the course of centuries; to confine papal authority within its primitive and constitutional limits; or to bring the Pope to lay aside the gorgeous sacerdotal vestments, which had taken the place of those of more early and simple ages, so long as German bishops appeared clad in ermine, wearing crowns upon their heads, and bearing swords at their sides.

Martin V. wisely proposed to bring the papal authority gradually

[1] This statute was published as early as the end of January, 1418, under the heading, "*Martini V.* reformatio in capite et curia Romana nationibus oblata." (*V. d. Hardt*, T. I., pp. 1021-1045.)

[2] These concordats, concluded with the Germans, were dated May 2, 1418 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., pp. 1055-1068). *Münch*, Complete collection of all the old and new concordats, Pt. I., p. 20 sq.; cf. *Hübler*, L, c.: "C. I. de numero et qualitate Cardinalium et eorum creatione quod numerum XXIV. non excedant, nisi pro honore nationum, quæ Cardinales non habent, unus vel duo pro semel de consilio et consensu Cardinalium assumendi viderentur; C. II. de provisione ecclesiar., monasterior., prioratuum, dignitatum et alior. beneficiorum; C. III., de annatis; C. IV. de causis tractandis in Romana curia nec ne; C. V. de commendis; C. VI. de simonia; C. VII. de non vitandis excommunitatis, antequam per judicem fuerint declarati et denuntiati; C. VIII. de dispensationibus; C. IX. de provisione Papæ et Cardinalium; C. X. de indulgentiis: cavebit Dominus noster Papa *in futurum* nimiam indulgentiarum effusionem, ne vilescant, et *in præteritum* concessas ab obitu Gregorii XI. ad instar alterius indulgentiæ revocat et annullat." Caution and discretion are specially recommended to pastors: Quia indulgentiarum materia gravis est, in ea caute ac discrete versentur (parochi), nec quidquam, quod fidei nostræ minus conveniens aut populo sit scandalosum, proferant!" C. XI. de horum concordatorum valore (in *Walter*, Fontes juris ecclesiast. antiqui et hodierni, pp. 86-96); with the English, July 12, 1418 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., pp. 1079-1082): C. I. de numero et ratione Cardinal.; C. II. de indulgentiis; C. III. de appropriationibus, unionib., incorporationib. ecclesiar. et vicariatuum; C. IV. de ornatu Pontificali inferioribus Prælatis non concedendo; C. V. de dispensationibus; C. VI. de Anglis ad officia Rom. curiæ assumendis; with the French, May 2, 1418 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. IV., pp. 1566-1579), on the same subjects, and besides, Prærogativa in obtinendis beneficiis Universitati Paris. concessa per Dom. Martinum Papam V.

within legitimate bounds, by commencing with the most flagrant abuses. He himself set the example by carrying into effect the general reforms contained in the *seven general* papal *decrees on reform*, which had been promulgated in the forty-third session of the Council By these decrees *all exemptions of late introduction were declared void; the revenues of vacant sees, formerly paid to the Pope, were given up; the practice of simony in ordinations, in elections, and in the conferring of benefices prohibited; all persons before coming into possession of a benefice were required to take orders; churches and ecclesiastics were exempted from the obligation of paying tithes to the Pope; and all clerics were instructed and commanded to dress as became their calling and condition.*

In the forty-fourth session of the Council, it was agreed that an œcumenical council should be held at Pavia, some time within the coming five years, and the announcement carried with it renewed hope of better things. In the thirty-ninth session a decree was passed directing that, in future, general councils should be held every ten years. The real intent of this decree was to make general councils an ordinary means of church government—a beautiful but wholly impracticable idea.

It had now become quite common to assert that the Pope was subject to an œcumenical council, and that appeals might be carried from him up to such tribunal for a new hearing. Martin, conscious that this opinion, if allowed to pass without censure, would work mischief, took the first favourable occasion to condemn it. A delegation of Poles represented to the Pope that *John von Falkenberg*, a native of Prussia, and member of the Order of St. Dominic, had written a work in the interest of the Teutonic Knights, in which some severe and offensive reflections were made upon the king and nobles of Poland, and requested that he would have it publicly condemned. The Pope, however, showed no inclination to comply with their request, and they appealed from him to the next œcumenical council. Martin then issued a bull, dated March 10th, in which he declared "*that it was unlawful for anyone either to appeal from the judgments of the Apostolic See, or to reject its decisions in matters of faith.*"[1]

In the forty-fifth and last session of the Council, held April 22, A. D. 1418, Martin confirmed those decrees relating to *matters of faith*, in the enactment of which the requirements of conciliar *usage* had been observed (quæ *in materia Fidei conciliariter* determinata, conclusa, et decreta fuissent), and excluded from this confirmation all

[1] Cf. *von der Hardt*, T. IV., pp. 1548-1564; *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 899; *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 1200 sq. *Gerson* protested against this bull (Tractat. quomodo et an liceat in causis fidei a summo Pontifice appellare seu ejus judicium declinare, Opp., T. II., pp. 303-308), and attempted to show that Martin's own authority was derived from the supreme authority of the council which had deposed Cossa. Still, he did not wish to extend the privilege of appeal from the Pope to *all* cases, but only to certain exceptional ones; because, if a limit were not placed somewhere, obedience to the Church would be but a barren formality. Even the Protestant *Mosheim* shows that to carry out such a principle in practice would be to destroy the idea of Catholic unity (De Gallorum appellationibus ad concilium universæ ecclesiæ unitatem ecclesiæ spectabilis tollentibus, Dissertat. ad H. E., T. I., p. 577 sq.)

decrees to which such a test did not apply.[1] This is evident from the acts of the Council, and from the declaration of Martin's successor, *Eugene IV.* (1446), who, in approving the acts of the Council of Constance, specially excepted whatever might be detrimental to the rights, dignity, and supremacy of the Holy See (*absque tamen præjudicio juris, dignitatis et præeminentiæ Sedis Apostolicæ*), which unquestionably includes the claims of superiority of œcumenical councils over Popes.[2] We cannot subscribe to the statement of *Huebler*, that Martin's words imply that he approved whatever had been decided *in matters of faith* after the prescriptive conciliar form, as opposed to the form of nations (*conciliariter*, not *nationaliter* only), because the nations did not frame a decree concerning the Falkenberg pamphlet, which was nevertheless finally condemned by the Pope.

The Council was formally closed May 16, A. D. 1418. Martin V. returned to Italy; but as Rome was in possession of the Neapolitans, Bologna an independent republic, and the remainder of his States in the hands of petty tyrants, he was obliged to remain for the present at Florence. Before his departure from Constance he had received a pressing invitation from the French, to again fix the Apostolic See at Avignon, and one equally pressing from Sigismund, who offered him his choice of the three cities of Basle, Strasburg, and Mentz, for the same purpose, both of which invitations he prudently declined. Balthasar Cossa (John XXIII.), who had been detained in prison since his deposition, now cast himself at the feet of Martin and implored forgiveness, and was by the latter created Cardinal-Bishop of Frascati. He died in the same year, A. D. 1419, at Florence, and was entombed in the celebrated baptistery of *San Giovanni*, opposite the cathedral.

Martin V. did not obtain possession of his capital till the year 1420, and then only by aid of the Florentines.

A difficulty that arose between Martin and the King of Aragon, again brought Peter de Luna into temporary prominence. He was succeeded by Muños, who styled himself Clement VIII., and in whom the line became extinct, after having done no further harm than to disturb, for a time, the quiet of the inconsiderable town of *Peñiscola*.

Martin V., faithful to the promise he had given to the Fathers of Constance, convoked an œcumenical *council*, which convened at *Pavia*, A. D. 1423; but a contagious disease, which shortly after broke out in that city, made it necessary to transfer the assembly to *Siena*.[3] But

[1] i. e., tumultuariter, or in particular congregations, or on subjects relating to ecclesiastical discipline, or per modum constitutionum synodalium.

[2] For want of the Pope's approbation, says the author, to some of the decrees, we have not, in former editions of this work, given the Council of Constance a place among the œcumenical councils of the Church. But, since the second Œcumenical Council of Constantinople (381) and the fourth Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon (451) labour under a like defect, and since, in recent times, those best qualified to give an opinion have, in consequence of the vital and wide-reaching consequences resulting from the decrees of Constance, pronounced daily more and positively in favour of its œcumenicity, we have also concluded to give it as the Sixteenth Œcumenical Council of the Church, subject, however, to the clausal qualifications of Popes *Martin V.* and *Eugene IV.*

[3] Conc. Senense, in *Harduin*, T. VIII., pp. 1013-1028. *Mansi*, T. XXVIII., pp 1057-1084.

few bishops were present, and they did little more than renew the *condemnation of the errors of Wycliffe and John Huss*, and propose a plan of reuniting the Greek and Latin Churches.

As the bishops, owing to the fewness of their number, the proximity of the theatre of war, and the importance of the subjects to come under discussion, were unwilling to go on with the Council, the Pope declared it dissolved. And so the work of reform was again put off until the next œcumenical council which, owing to the threatening attitude of the Hussites, was, immediately before the death of Martin V. (February 20, A. D. 1431), convoked to assemble at *Basle*. As the measures adopted by the Fathers of Constance, instead of satisfying the wishes of those who were thoroughly in earnest in their desire to have a complete reformation of the Church, served rather to make them more anxious to see the work pushed *vigorously* forward, the successor to Martin was obliged to enter upon the difficult and long-deferred task, with all the troublesome issue which it involved.

§ 272. *Eugene IV.* (A. D. 1431-1447—*Nicholas V.* (A. D. 1447-1455)—*The Council of Basle; its protest against being transferred to Ferrara and Florence—Emperor Sigismund—Albert II.* (A. D. 1438-1439)—*Frederic III.* (A. D. 1440-1493).

For acts, see **Mansi*, T. XXIX.-XXXI.; *Harduin*, T. VIII., IX.; and *Würdtwein*, Subsidia diplom. Heidelb., 1774 sq., T. VIII.-IX. *Ang. Mai*, Spicilegium rom., Rom., 1829, T. I., pp. 1-61 (in Eugene IV. and Nichol. V.) *Æneas Sylvius*, Comment. de reb. Basileæ gestis, etc. (1438-40), libb. III., Bas., 1577, ed. *Mich. Catalonus*, Firmi, 1803, 4to. At the head of these writings, more or less partial, must be placed *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum ac fugiendarum* (a weak elaboration which does not originate from *Orthuinus Gratius*), Colon., 1535; Lond., 1690)[1] *Augustinus Patricius* (canon of Siena), Summa concilior. Bas., Florent., etc. (*Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1081 sq.; *Hartzheim*, Conc. Germ. T. V., p. 474.) *Ambrosii Traversari*, Epp. ed. Laur. Mehus., Florent., 1759 f. The Scriptores Concilii Basil., in Monumenta Concilior., sæc. XV., ed. *Palazky* et *Birk*, Vienn., 1857. *Richerii*, Hist. conc. general., libri III., c. 2 sq., T. II., pp. 305-670. *Natal. Alex.*, Hist. eccles., sæc. XV., diss. VIII. *Hefele*, A glance at the fifteenth century, etc., cf. above, § 270. The *same*, Hist. of Councils, Vol. VII., Pt. II., Freiburg, 1874. *Wessenberg*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 271-513. The *Catholic*, 1841, July, Aug., and Sept. numbers.

Eugene's intentions were known to be honest and sincere, and his accession to the papal throne was hailed with joy, as opening a future full of hope to the Church.

Before the election, the cardinals had drawn up a series of articles, requiring the reformation of the Papal Court, and defining the relations of the Pope to the Sacred College, which each bound himself under oath to carry out in case the choice should fall upon him. Eugene, after his elevation, not only stood by this agreement, but also had the articles published in a separate bull.

He did not suffer the conflict of arms which was carried on both within and without the city of Rome, to deter him from entering

[1] Against the authorship of the celebrated Cologne humanist, *Ortwin Gratius*, cf. *Dr Cremans*, in the Annals of the Histor. Association of the Lower Rhine, and especially of the ancient archdiocese of Cologne, nro. 23, pp. 192-224, Cologne, 1871

upon the projected reforms of his predecessors. He convoked the Œcumenical Council to meet at Basle, and confirmed the choice of Martin V., who had appointed Cardinal *Julian Cesarini*, a man distinguished both for learning and a talent for business, to preside over it. But as this cardinal was at the time engaged in endeavouring to bring about an accommodation with the Hussites in Bohemia, the Pope selected two plenipotentiaries, Doctor *John Polemar*, and *John of Ragusa*, a Dominican, to preside in his stead till such time as he should be free to do so himself.

The Council was opened, July 23, 1431. As yet there were no bishops present, and only a few doctors, canons, and abbots.[1] Cardinal Cesarini, convinced that all efforts to reconcile the Hussites to the Church would involve a useless waste of time and labour, gave up the task as hopeless, and set out on his journey for Basle, where he arrived in the month of September. He sent word to the Pope by John *Beaupère*, a canon of Besançon, that owing to the threatened war between Philip of Burgundy and Frederic of Austria, very few of the bishops were in attendance at the Council; that the heresy of John Huss was rapidly spreading in both these countries, and that the clergy were in consequence exposed to insult and injury.

Eugene, influenced by these representations, and anxious to avail himself of the favourable temper of mind exhibited by the Greeks, who had made proposals for a reunion with the Western Church, but who expressed a wish to meet in some *Italian* town, resolved to suspend the proceedings of the Council of Basle, and announced that the Fathers would convene at Bologna eighteen months later. This bull was dated November 12, A. D. 1431. But learning shortly afterwards that the Fathers of Basle had invited the advocates of Huss's doctrine to a discussion of the controverted points, notwithstanding the fact that these had already been formally condemned as heretical, the Pope at once determined to dissolve the Council, which he did, December 12, A. D. 1431.[2]

The prelates assembled at Basle, who numbered only twelve, either not hearing of the action of the Pope, or disregarding it, went on, and opened the *first session* of the Council, on the 14th day of December.[3] Julian did not even await the return of the messengers whom he had sent to Rome to confer with the Pope on the business of the Council.

The Council, in its first session, declared itself lawfully convened, and proceeded to define its aim and scope, which were said to be *the extinction of heresy, and the closing of the Greek schism; the strengthening of faith, and the establishment of peace among Christian princes; the reformation of the Church in her Head and members, and the revival of ancient discipline.*

[1] Cf. *Mansi's* note to *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1431, nro. 21.

[2] *Eugenii*, Ep. ad Julian. Cardin. and Bulla revocationis, in *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1575 sq. Cf. *Raynald.*, Ad. a. 1431, nro. 21.

[3] The acts of this first and following sessions are in *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1103 sq., and *Mansi*, T. XXIX., p. 3 sq.

To facilitate the transaction of business, all the members of the Council were to be divided into *four bodies*, representing the Italian, French, German, and Spanish nations. From these were to be formed *four committees*, consisting of an equal number of prelates and doctors, selected from the representatives of each nation, who should discuss in turn and adopt or reject every proposed measure, after it had been admitted as a legitimate subject for discussion by another committee of twelve. When any measure had been adopted by one of the four committees, it was to be passed on to the next, and thence to the president of Council, who should propose it at the next of the general congregations, which were to be held weekly. Should it be accepted here also, it was to be cast into the form of decree, and solemnly proclaimed at the next session.

Owing to the small number of those present, this plan could not be carried into effect in the early days of the Council.

When the bull adjourning the Council arrived, in January, 1432, the Fathers expressed great indignation, and even Cardinal Julian urged the necessity of continuing the Council in the city in which it had been first opened.[1] It was argued that if the Council should now close its sittings, such a course would give colour of truth to the bitter and slanderous attacks of the Hussites, who might then claim, with apparent justice, that the Fathers of the Church, fearing to meet adversaries so formidable in open discussion, had prudently taken to flight to escape the disgrace of defeat.

Cardinal Julian also represented that the Pope had been induced to issue the bull of dissolution by false and untrustworthy reports, whereupon the Council, insisting on its fancied rights, published an encyclic to the Christian world,[2] in which it declared that it was lawfully convened in the Holy Ghost, and expressed its determination to go on and finish the good work it had commenced.

Some Parisian doctors, carried away by immoderate warmth, asserted that the very thought of dissolving the Council was an inspiration of the devil.

It would seem that the opposition of the Fathers at Basle to any dissolution of the Council was, to some extent, based on worthy motives, and their good intentions secured for them the general approbation of the Catholic world. The French bishops assembled at *Bourges* declared that the Council was a lawfully constituted body, and expressed a purpose of attending it themselves, and of sending a memorial to the Pope, requesting him to allow the Fathers to continue their work for the good of the Church.

The Emperor Sigismund, who had been lately made *King of Bohemia*, was, of all the temporal princes, the most interested in the

[1] In *Raynald.*, Ad a. 1432, nro. 22; more complete in Fasciculus rer. expetend., Colon, 1535, pp. 28-32.

[2] *Harduin*, T. VIII., pp. 1315-1317: "Sacrosancta generalis synod. Basil. in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, universalem ecclesiam repræsentans, universis Christi fidelibus."

continuance of the Council. He wrote to the Pope, assuring him that when the Fathers extended the invitation to the Bohemians, there was no intention to discuss disputed points of doctrine, but merely to explain them more fully to the heretics.

The *determination* of the Fathers of Basle and of the temporal princes *to go on with the Council* was strengthened by the persistent refusal of the Pope to yield to their demands. The Council continued to assert that it was a lawfully organized body, and *in the second session*, held February 15, at which only fourteen bishops were present, *renewed the decrees of the Council of Constance, declaring an œcumenical council to be superior to the Pope.* In the *third session*, held April 29, the Fathers requested the Pope to withdraw his bull dissolving the Council, and summoned both him and his cardinals to appear at Basle within three months; or, should he be unable to come himself, to send legates to represent him.

Nicholas de Cusa, Dean of St. Florinus, at Coblenz, whom Cardinal Julian had called to the Council, and who was afterwards created cardinal and raised to the bishopric of Brixen, was especially conspicuous by the energy and ability with which he defended the course of the Fathers of Basle. Born at Cues, near Treves, he received his early education from the "Brothers of the Common Life," at Deventer, whence he passed to the University of Padua, and there distinguished himself for his ability in the studies of canon and civil law. His proficiency in the two last-named branches, the wide range of his learning, and his extensive acquaintance with ecclesiastical history, mathematics, and philosophy, gained him a great reputation among his contemporaries, who bestowed upon him the honourable title of "*Decretorum Doctor.*"[1]

Nicholas believed that the existing state of the Church imperatively called for an œcumenical council, and had regarded its assemblage at Basle with pleasurable hope. Impressed with this conviction, he wrote his celebrated work, "De Concordantia Catholica, Libri Tres," published A. D. 1433, in which he brought forward a great array of historical documents to sustain the course the Council had hitherto pursued.

This work may be regarded as embodying the views of all the great thinkers of that age, such as *Gerson*, *d'Ailly*, *Nicholas de*

[1] *Nicolai Cusani*, Opp., Basil., 1565, 3 T. f.; hitherto unprinted documents concerning the same, in Tübg. Quart. Review, 1830, p. 171. †*Harzheim*, Vita Nicolai de Cusa, Trevir., 1730. Corrections and additions thereto (Tübg. Quart. Rev., 1831, p. 386). †**Scharpff*, Religious and literary influence of Nicholas de Cusa (in Tübg. *Quart.*, 1837, pp. 201 and 287). The *same*, The Cardinal and Bishop Nicholas de Cusa, Mentz, 1843, Pt. I. as Pt. II.: "The most important writings of the cardinal," in Germ., Freiburg, 1862; Pt. III., 1871. †**Düx*, The German cardinal, Nicholas de Cusa, and the Church of his Age, Ratisbon, 1847, 2 vols. †*Clemens*, Giordano Bruno and Nichol. Cusa, being a philosophical essay, Bonn., 1847. *Zimmermann*, Nicholas Cusanus, the forerunner of Leibnitz (Vol. VIII. of the Reports of the Philos. and Histor. Department of the Vienna Academy of Sciences, year 1852). †*Jaeger*, The Quarrel of Cardinal Nich. Cusan. with Sigismund, Duke of Austria, Innsbruck, 1861, 2 vols. †*Stumpf*, The Political Views of Nich. of Cues, Cologne, 1865.

Clemange, and a host of doctors of inferior name, on the constitution and government of the Church in general; on the relations of the Pope to an œcumenical council, and to the bishops, and of the spiritual to the temporal authority. An analysis of this work will, therefore, not be out of place here, at least of that part of it which treats of the relation of the Pope to an œcumenical council.

The Church, says *Nicholas de Cusa*,[1] is the living union in Christ, and through Christ of all intelligent beings,[2] who thus constitute his mystical Body.[3] Hence the Church is *one* both in essence and character, but her members are divided into three classes, corresponding to the three states of the Church, namely, the Church *militant*, the Church *suffering*, and the Church *triumphant*.[4] Again, the Sacraments, the Priesthood, and the Laity, are the three elements of the Church militant essential to the preservation of union among her members. The Sacraments are channels through which, by the ministration of the priesthood, the grace of Jesus Christ is conveyed to the laity; and this priestly ministration is as essential as a medium of communication between Christ, the Spiritual Head of the Church, and the body of the faithful, as is the ministration of the soul in man for maintaining the proper relations between spirit and matter. The *priesthood*, therefore, guided as it is by the Holy Ghost, is truly the soul of the body of the faithful,[5] its very office being to direct, quicken, and enlighten the body.

As there are different faculties in the human soul, so also are there different orders and varying degrees in the priesthood, and the highest of these is the *episcopacy*.[6] As regards orders and jurisdiction, all bishops are absolutely equal, and whatever distinction exists among them rises out of the peculiar character of the administrative authority of each, or is dependent on the special conditions of the Church over which each is set. The distinctions of rank and precedence, and the more or less ample authority enjoyed by the several bishops, are determined by the greater or less importance of the churches over which they are respectively placed. The formation of the Church's constitution after this fashion was *not the issue of chance*, but the work of design, *its origin being due to divine appointment and apostolic ordinance*. The same overseeing Providence was pleased that Rome, which had of old been the centre of error, should in these latter days become the centre of truth, and *that its bishops should be set over all the others*.[7] And, in matter of fact, Christ Himself set Peter over all the other apostles, that through Him division might be avoided, unity preserved, and the whole Church be linked by the bonds of love to a living centre.[8] This dignity and prerogative became the inalienable right of the See of Rome, and passed on unimpaired, from St. Peter to his successors, through all succeeding ages;[9] and hence whosoever has broken the bond of union with the Bishop of Rome is outside the Church.[10]

In all *matters of faith*, an *œcumenical* council is the supreme and infallible authority,[11] inasmuch as it represents the priesthood of the universal Church, to which Christ committed the power of binding and loosing, and bestowed the gift of infallibility.[12] An œcumenical council does not, therefore, derive its authority from him who has the right of convoking it, and whose right ceases *once the council has been constituted*, but directly and immediately *from Christ*. Neither is it essential that the Pope should convoke an œcumenical council, for the first eight councils, though truly œcumenical in character, were not convoked by Popes.[13] Neither does the president of a council give binding force to its decrees. All that is essential to this end is the harmonious and unanimous assent of the Fathers, directed by the guidance of the Holy Ghost, and assisted by the presence of Jesus Christ in their midst.[14]

---

[1] This analysis by *Hefele* (in the *Giessen Annuary* of Theol., Vol. VI., p. 361-368).
[2] Lib. I., c. 1. [3] Lib. II., c. 18. [4] Lib. I., c. 4. [5] Lib. I., c. 8.
[6] Lib. I., c. 6. [7] Lib. I., c. 5-15. [8] Lib. I., c. 11.
[9] These and other like utterances are not, indeed, calculated to support what *Gieseler* says in his Text-book of Ch. Hist., Vol. II., Pt. IV., p. 62, viz., that the concordantia catholica of *Nich. of Cusa* contains propositions "menacing the very foundations of the papacy." *Brockhaus*, Nic. Cusani de concil. universal. potestate sententia explicatur, Lps., 1867. Conf. Scharpff, Pt. III.; cf. Bonn. Review of Theol., Lit., nro. 7, year 1872.
[10] Lib. I., c. 14, 15. [11] Lib. II., c. 5. [12] Lib. II., c. 18.
[13] Lib. II., c. 25. [14] Lib II.. c., 8, 9.

As *unanimity* is a condition of truth, every member is an integral part of the Council, and no one possessing a right to be there can be either refused admittance into it, or, once there, be ejected.[1] The right of participating in a council and of casting a *definitive* vote is confined to the *bishops* or their *plenipotentiaries*. But, aside from absolute right, it is a wise and wholesome practice to summon to a council learned priests and doctors of canon law, whose wisdom and ability may be of service to the Fathers.[2]

The right of framing decrees of such a character as will bind the whole Church, without distinction of persons, is confined exclusively to an œcumenical council,[3] because the very office of such an assembly is to give expression to the wants of the whole Church and to provide the best means for her government.

The Pope, inasmuch as he is the Chief Pastor of the whole Church and her accredited representative upon earth, has also the right of framing *decrees;* but these neither bind the intellects and consciences of the faithful nor carry with them a sanction equal to those of an œcumenical council until after they have been promulgated to the whole Catholic world, and accepted by it. The Pope's supremacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church once admitted, it follows as a consequence that neither a particular nor an œcumenical council can lawfully convene without his consent and sanction.[4] The Pope and an œcumenical council both represent the Church—the latter accurately and adequately, since its voice is the expression of the assembled pastors of the Christian world; the former in a confused and consequently less precise and complete sense. Inasmuch, therefore, as the judgments of an œcumenical council express the sense of the universal Church with fulness and accuracy, they are more reliable than those of the Pope, and should receive more ready acceptance.[5] And although the Pope possesses the right to preside at an œcumenical council, he is, for all that, but a fraction of it; and as the whole is greater than any of its parts,[6] *so also is a council superior to the Pope.*[7]

History is a witness to this superiority of an œcumenical council, and the most distinguished among the Popes have themselves freely admitted such to be the case. The decrees of an œcumenical council are as binding upon the Pope as upon any other member of the Church of Christ. He is not only obliged to give them the same willing obedience that others give, but, as *St. Leo* says, since such decrees are inspired by God, the Pope has a duty of *first* obeying them himself, that his prompt submission to God and to his holy Church may serve as an example to others. Having done this much himself, he has the further duty of seeing to it that these decrees are observed by others also.[8]

Still, there are some cases of extraordinary emergency and pressing necessity, in which the good of the Church requires that some general ordinance of an œcumenical council should be dispensed with; and in such cases the Pope has the faculty to dispense; provided, however, he take counsel with the cardinals, before proceeding to act, when the affair is of grave importance.[9]

As regards the limits of the authority which an œcumenical council may exercise over a Pope, this much seems to be established, that he may be deposed by his inferiors if he adhere to a *heresy* which has been once condemned. There is but one rule in this matter, applicable alike to him and every other member of the Church; for heresy, of its very nature, is such that a Pope, by the simple fact of embracing it (*eo ipso*), not only deprives himself of all claims to his office, but also puts himself outside the Church by his own act.

Whether crimes of another nature, though of a serious character, constitute sufficient ground for deposition, admits of grave doubt. The more generally accepted opinion runs counter to such a supposition, on the ground that no spiritual superior can be lawfully deposed either by his inferiors or by a synod convoked by his authority, and maintains that, when an instance of this sort occurs, the superior must, in any event, be borne with, and, if possible, be reformed. But this principle, though held by many, must be put aside when there is question of the relations between the Pope and an œcumenical council;[10] *for an œcumenical council, being of its very nature above the Pope, must, as a consequence, possess the general right of passing judgment upon him*, and, if so, of deposing him for crimes other than that of heresy. The very aim and scope of a council being to remove abuses, it must possess the further power and authority, which such purpose implies, of bringing the cause of these abuses to judgment, even though he should be the

---

[1] Lib. II., c. 15.
[2] Lib. II., c. 16, 23.
[3] Lib. II., c. 9.
[4] Lib. II., c. 15.
[5] Lib. II., c. 18.
[6] Lib. II., c. 15.
[7] Lib. II., c. 17.
[8] Lib. II., c. 20.
[9] Lib. II., c. 21.
[10] Lib. II., c. 17.

Pope himself.[1] But, while possessing this supreme authority, the Council should never lose sight of the exalted position of the august Head of the Church—should proceed against him with that respectful reverence due to his character and office, and should first employ every reasonable measure of conciliation, and have recourse to its deposing power only in very extreme cases.

Such were the views that had swayed the Fathers of Basle from the commencement of the Council, and upon which they still continued to act. Cardinal Julian had resigned his office of president of the Council in January, on receipt of the papal bull closing its sessions and transferring it to Bologna; but, fearing that great evils might follow if the instructions of the Pope were carried into execution, he pressed upon him the necessity of acknowledging the Council. The Fathers went on with their work, and in the *fourth session* (June 20, A. D. 1432), granted letters of safe conduct to the Bohemians and prescribed rules for the direction of the Pope's conduct.

The archbishops *Andrew of Colocza* and *John of Tarento*,[2] who came to Basle as papal nuncios, were admitted to an audience on the 22nd of August, and protested, but in vain, against this spirit of hostility to the Pope. The Emperor *Sigismund* also besought the Fathers to become reconciled to the Pope, but his attempts were equally ineffectual; they would hear none of this. They addressed a harsh letter to Eugene, in which they charged him with being the author of the schism, and set forth their own claims to be recognized as a Council lawfully convened in the Holy Ghost (*synodus in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata*), and possessing the plenitude of conciliar authority. The Council, in its *sixth session* (September 6), at which there were present but thirty-two bishops, went the length of moving, through its promoters, that the Pope should be declared *obstinate* (*contumax*).

The pretensions of the Council increased as time went on, and so reckless were the means adopted by the Fathers to create a public opinion adverse to the Pope, that they did not hesitate to give currency to the most damaging and unfounded reports regarding his moral character. Cardinal Julian again resumed the presidency of the Council in the *seventh session* (November 5), when it was enacted that in the event of the Holy See becoming vacant, the election of the new Pope should take place *only at Basle;* and in the eighth session, a term of sixty days was prescribed to Eugene, as the extreme limit before the expiration of which he was charged to recall his bull of dissolution. Finally, in the *tenth session* (February 19, A. D. 1433), a decree was passed declaring the Pope both disobedient and *obstinate*.

Eugene, believing that the obstacles which, as he at first thought, stood in the way of the salutary action of the Council, had now passed

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] See these discourses in *Mansi*, T. XXIX., p. 468-492; *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1518-1540. Archbishop Andrew places at the head of his discourse those words of the apostle: "Non sit schisma in corpore."

away, began to regard its continuance with more favour, and entered upon a line of conduct looking towards reconciliation with the Fathers of Basle.[1] He published a bull, dated August 1, A. D. 1433, by which he revoked his former decree of dissolution. He also signified his intention of taking part in the Council, and instructed his legates to enter upon the preliminary measures necessary to that end.

The Fathers of Basle, on the contrary, showed no disposition to make peace, and so immoderate were their pretensions that they still insisted that the Council represented the universal Church (*universalem Ecclesiam repræsentans*), rejected the greater part of the papal propositions, and took exception to some expressions contained in the bull of August 1. The Pope had there said, "*we will and are content*" that the Council shall continue, instead of which he was required to say, "we decree and declare" (*decernimus et declaramus*). It was further claimed that, in his instructions to his legates, Eugene had made use of offensive terms, which should also be corrected; and that the principle implied in his proposal to conduct all business with the advice of the Council (*cum consilio Consilii*) could not be admitted, inasmuch as by its admission the Fathers, from being judges, would sink to the unimportant rank of advisers.

The Fathers continued, from the eleventh to the fifteenth session, to pass decrees derogatory to the dignity of the Pope, and designed to weaken his authority. Many of the Italian princes, taking advantage of the embarrassing condition of Eugene, and under pretext of protecting the Council, carried war into every quarter of the Papal States, seized fortified places, and took possession of entire provinces. Eugene went on making concession after concession, till he finally consented to subscribe a document, drawn up by the Fathers, in which it was asserted that the Council had been from the beginning a lawfully convened body. This having been read to the Council in the *sixteenth session* (February 5, 1434), the Fathers, in their turn, permitted the papal legates to preside, and in the seventeenth session (April 26, A. D. 1434) *recalled everything that had been said against either the person of the Pope or the dignity of his office.*[2]

These mutual concessions restored peace to the Council, and gained for it the respect and reverence of the Catholic world. The presence of the Emperor *Sigismund* in Basle contributed not a little to bring about this happy result.

While the very existence of the Council was a matter of doubt, and seemed to depend upon the issue of the oft-renewed controversies on the principles of authority, it is not wonderful that no progress should have been made towards accomplishing the purpose for which it was primarily convoked; but since peace reigned once more, and,

[1] Cf. *Raynald*, Ad an., 1433, nro. 19 sq. The bulls of Eugene are in *Mansi*, T. XXIX., p. 574; *Harduin*, T. VIII., pp. 1168-1172. Cf. *Mansi*, L. c., p. 72 sq.

[2] Such is the account given by an eye-witness, *Augustinus Patricius*, who relates it in his Summa Conciliorum.

in consequence, the Fathers were daily receiving fresh accessions to their numbers, it should seem that now at least the Council would apply itself with energy and zeal to *the extinction of heresy, the reunion and reconciliation of all Christians, and the reformation of the Church.*

It was not long, however, before it became painfully evident that the Fathers, while professing to be reconciled to the Pope, had no intention either of giving up their former doctrines or of forsaking their factious leaders. In the *seventeenth session* they declared that the papal legates possessed no *coercive authority*, and in the *eighteenth* (June 26, A. D. 1434), again brought forward the decree of Constance, in which the jurisdiction of an œcumenical council is declared to be superior to that of the Pope. The time, too, seemed favourable for the Fathers to bring on such a measure. The Duke of Milan was fomenting and abetting rebellion in the States of the Church, and so closely was the Pope pressed, that he was obliged to escape in disguise to Florence.

In the *nineteenth session* (September 7th), some advance was made towards the real work for which the Council had avowedly convened. It was proposed to hold a council in Italy, at which the Pope, the Greek Emperor, the Oriental Patriarchs, and bishops should be present, and in which such measures should be taken as would bring about the union of the Eastern and Western Churches.

In the *twentieth* and following sessions a number of *stringent reformatory decrees* were passed; some against the practice of *concubinage* among the clergy, and the *abuse of appeals* and *interdicts;* others providing for the abolition of *annats*, and of those *unbecoming practices* and *sacrilegious disorders* that took place in certain churches, and of which the Fools' Feasts, banquets, and fairs were the occasion; and still others, whose special purpose was to insure the *worthy and becoming celebration of the Divine service.* The Fathers also gave particular attention to the mode of procedure in future conclaves for the election of a Pope, specified the qualifications requisite in a candidate, and prescribed the oath to be taken and the profession of faith to be read. They moreover enacted special laws, to which the College of Cardinals were expected to conform.

In the sixteenth session provision had already been made for the regular holding of *diocesan* synods and *provincial councils.* The excessive zeal of the Fathers for reform hurried them beyond the limits of decency and justice, when, in the *twenty-third session* (March 25, 1436), they passed decrees which, if carried into execution, would reduce the Papal See to a state of degrading servitude and annihilate the last semblance of the Pope's authority, whose exercise in deciding canonical elections is frequently so necessary.[1] They attempted to

[1] Æneas Sylvius, speaking from personal knowledge, says: "Against *one* unworthy individual nominated by the Pope to some office, I am ready, at any time, to adduce a thousand instances of rude, stupid, and utterly unfit men promoted by chapters and ordinaries."

cut off from him sources of revenue, without which he would be unable, not indeed to maintain the dignity of his station, but to meet the necessary expenses of his office; and to deprive him of rights and prerogatives which were peculiarly and essentially his own. Measures so ungenerous and illegal excited the suspicions and cooled the ardour of the warmest and most tried friends of the Council. *Nicholas de Cusa* was the first to perceive that a change in public opinion was setting in. To add to the growing discontent, the Fathers, while despoiling the Pope of his *annats and the tribute* paid to the Roman See, when benefices were conferred and confirmed, authorized a tax to be levied on the inferior clergy for the maintenance of the Council, thus appropriating to their use revenues to which they had no claim, and crying down as an abuse their payment to the Holy See, whose right to them was unquestionable. Even this was not the most flagrant violation on their part of the reformatory measures which they prescribed to the Pope, and of the decrees of Constance, to which they so frequently and confidently appealed.

They went so far as to propose to put indulgences on sale for the purpose of obtaining the sums requisite to carry forward the contemplated measures for the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches.

The papal legates and some among the most distinguished Fathers of the Council protested against this mode of raising money, as one directly opposed to the spirit of the Church, fraught with dangerous consequences, and calculated to bring dishonour upon the whole body of the clergy.

Eugene IV., convinced that there was no hope of coming to terms with the Fathers of Basle, addressed an encyclic to the European sovereigns, in which he condemned the irregular proceedings of the Council against the person and office of the Pope. He particularly insisted on the acts of the *twenty-third session*, in which the Council had prescribed the mode of procedure in the future election of Popes; regulated the smallest details of the Papal goverr ment, and drawn up a profession of faith, embodying the offensive decrees of Constance and Basle, affirming the superiority of an œcumenical council to a Pope. He also said that the Council had taken up a number of subjects which of their nature were beyond its competency, and had interfered in the political issues that then distracted Europe, thus prejudicing, by such imprudent action, the main purpose for which it had been convoked. The Pope had serious thoughts at this time of either dissolving the Council altogether or transferring it to some other city.

In the meantime *negotiations* had been going forward looking *towards the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches.* The majority of the Fathers of Basle were in favour of having the Council meet at Basle, Avignon, or some city of Savoy, while the papal legates, and the more influential among the prelates, proposed that it should be held at either Florence, Udine, or some other Italian city. The Greek ambassador also preferred one of the latter places, which, he said, would possess the double advantage of being more con-

venient to the Pope and more easily accessible to his own countrymen. Eugene, upon these representations, approved the suggestion of his legates, and decided in favour of holding the Council in an Italian city. When the news of his decision reached Basle, the Fathers were so indignant that they put aside even the simulated respect which they had thus far observed when speaking of the Head of the Church. Eugene was charged with grave offences, though there was not a shred of evidence to prove his guilt; and in the *twenty-sixth session* (July 31, A. D. 1437), both he and the cardinals were cited to appear before the Council of Basle, to answer for their conduct, within sixty days. The Pope, of course, paid no attention to this citation, and in consequence the Basilians, in the *twenty-eighth session* (October 1st), declared him contumacious.

Eugene issued a bull, dated September 11, 1437, and beginning "*Doctor Gentium*," by which he transferred the Council to *Ferrara*, to enter upon the work of the reunion of the two Churches. All the prelates of Basle were invited to attend, but some excused their absence under pretext that one of the disputed articles still remained to be settled with the Hussites.

The fury of these latter increased in proportion as the numbers, authority, and importance of the Council opened at Ferrara augmented; and hence, from the twenty-fourth session onward until its close, the Catholic world ceased to regard the Synod of Basle as possessing *an œcumenical character*.[1]

They, however, claimed that their assembly was truly œcumenical, and to all appearances there were now two general councils in session, each of which declared the decrees of the other null and void, and each held threats of excommunication over those prelates who should continue to participate in the acts of the other.

Cardinal L'Allemand, Archbishop of Arles, a man of great energy of character and determination, was now the leading spirit at Basle, and in the *twenty-ninth session*, the Fathers, acting under his powerful influence, declared void the papal bull dissolving the Council, and threatened to depose Eugene if he would not consent to recall it. They were not deterred by the fewness of their numbers from carrying their threat into execution, and in the *thirty-first session* (January 24, A. D. 1438), although reduced to twenty-five bishops and seventeen abbots, declared the Pope *suspended*, and incapable of exercising the functions of his office; and, as a consequence of this, in the thirty-second session (March 24th), pronounced the Council of Ferrara a *schismatical conventicle*, and cited its members to appear personally within thirty days before the tribunal of Basle.

Even the *personal* enemies of the Pope, such as the King of Aragon

[1] *Bellarminus*, De eccles. militante, c. 16: "Dico, Basileense Concilium initio quidem fuisse legitimum; nam et Legatus aderat Romani Pontificis et Episcopi plurimi; at a quo tempore Eugenium deposuit et Felicem elegit, non fuit concilium eccl., sed conciliabulum schismaticum, seditiosum et nullius prorsus auctoritatis." Cf. *Idem*, De Concilior. auctoritate, c. 16.

and the Duke of Milan, censured this silly arrogance; the Duke of Bavaria declared war against the Basilians, as they were now called; and the King of England asserted that they had brought on the age of Antichrist.

The electors of Germany, who were then assembled at Frankfort, for the purpose of electing a king, expressed a determination to remain *neutral* until they should have completed their own work; but when, on the 17th of March, A. D. 1438, the choice fell upon Albert of Austria, they did not attempt to conceal their discontent with the Fathers of Basle. Notwithstanding that France had forbidden her bishops to attend the Council of Ferrara, many of them disregarded the prohibition, and an *assembly* of the clergy, held at *Bourges*, endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation between the two parties.

The Basilians, either unconscious that the tide of public opinion in Catholic Europe was setting against them, or rendered desperate and reckless by the hopelessness of their cause, continued their opposition to the Pope. They exhausted every effort to fix the note of heresy upon Eugene, that they might have a specious pretext for deposing him; for this purpose they framed, in the *thirty-third session* (May 16, A. D. 1439), and after a stormy debate succeeded in promulgating, eight so-called articles of faith (*fidei Catholicæ veritates*), to which they knew Eugene would not subscribe. The drift of these was that an œcumenical council was above the Pope, and that Eugene, having acted contrary to this fundamental principle in several instances, should be branded with the note of heresy.[1] The Basilians, having defined what constituted heresy, and declared that Eugene was guilty of it, saw the rest of their way clear before them. They deposed the Pope in the *thirty-fourth session* (June 26th), and in the *thirty-fifth* (July 8th), after solemnly affirming the necessity of continuing the Council, proceeded to elect his successor. They were careful, in making their choice, to select a person who, by his wealth and connections, might relieve the financial embarrassments of the Council, and regain the influence which it was rapidly losing in every royal house in Europe. Such a one was found in *Amadeus VIII. of Savoy*, who, three years before, had resigned his crown in favour of his son, and withdrawn, with a body of knights, whom he organized into the Order of St. Maurice, to the pleasant town of Ripailles, on the shores of Lake Geneva. He took the name of *Felix V.*, and was recognized by his own hereditary states, by the kings of Aragon and Hungary, and by a few German princes, and a number of universities *Albert II.* had died, November 5, A. D. 1439, while these events were going forward, and his cousin, *Frederic III.*, ascended the throne.

Now that an antipope was elected, it was further necessary to

[1] The first three ran thus: 1. Veritas est cath. fidei, st. generale Conc. supra Papam et alium quemvis potestatem habere; 2. Generale Concilium legitime congregatum sine ipsius consensu nec dissolvere, nec transferre, nec prorogare ad tempus ex autoritate sua potest Romanus Pontifex, idque veritatis ejusdem est; 3. Qui pertinaciter his veritatibus se opponit, hæreticus est consendus.

supply money for his own support and for the proper maintenance of a court becoming his dignity; and, to meet this demand, the same assembly which, but a short time before, had indignantly protested against the abuse of annats, and in consequence abolished them, now gave its sanction to levies incomparably more burdensome. Permission was given to Felix V. to impose a tax of one-fifth for the coming five years, and of one-tenth for the next ensuing five, upon the revenues of all ecclesiastical benefices.

These high-handed proceedings excited public indignation against the Basilians; and even those of their own number most distinguished for learning and ability—such as Cardinal Julian; Nicholas, Archbishop of Palermo; *Nicholas de Cusa;* and even *Æneas Sylvius*, who had been the secretary and the most eloquent defender of the Council of Basle, and, in the year 1440, secretary to the antipope, Felix V.—now passed over to the other side. As the authority of the assembly of Basle declined, its advocates became proportionately bold and reckless; but such behaviour only contributed to strip it of what little prestige it still possessed, and to make the few remaining sessions excessively wearisome to the members themselves. When, at length, Felix V. withdrew from Basle to Lausanne, under pretext of restoring his health, the Fathers, in the *forty-fifth session* (May 16, A. D. 1443), brought the proceedings to a close.

Such was the end of a council which, in its early days, entered with commendable zeal and energy upon the work of reform, possessed the confidence and commanded the respect of many, and was so full of promise to the Church. Weakened by internal dissensions and by the gradual defection of its members, and animated by a stubborn spirit of disobedience, it brought on its own dissolution, and, in its last days, became the very scourge of the Church.

We shall have occasion to speak, in paragraph 278, of the continuation of this council at Ferrara and Florence.

Owing to the complicated condition of affairs at Basle, a diet assembled at *Mentz*, in March, A. D. 1439, at which there were present three ecclesiastical electors, and the ambassadors of the kings of France Castile, and Portugal, and of the Duke of Milan. The cause of Eugene was ably and eloquently defended by *John Turrecremata*[1] and *Nicholas de Cusa*, both among the most eminent men of that age. The former made a brilliant speech, in which he showed the contradictory character and logical inconsistency of the position taken by the Fathers of Basle, who contended that there was a clear distinction between the Head of the Church dispersed and the Head of the Church assembled in an œcumenical council; and that the Pope, while truly the Head of the Church in the former sense, was not so

[1] *Joan de Turrecremata* (Dominican and Magister S. Palatii), Tractatus notabilis de potestate papæ et concilii generalis, Coloniæ, 1480; de pontificis maximi conciliique generalis auctoritate, in *Harduini*, Acta concil., T. IX., p. 1235 sq.; summa de ecclesia et ejus auctoritate, libri IV. (Lugd., 1496; Venet., 1561.) On his other numerous writings, cf. *Nicol. Antonio*, Bibliotheca vetus Hispan., ed. *Bayer*, T. II., pp. 286-293.

in the latter. In other words, they contended that, though the Pope was, in true sense, the supreme Head of the Catholic Church, scattered over the world, and considered both individually and collectively, he could lay no claim to this prerogative when the same Church spoke through her representatives assembled in an œcumenical council.

Turrecremata also showed the absurdity of asserting that a council *without* the Pope, *its* legitimate *Head*, could represent the Church. But, for all this, the diet approved, with some modifications, the reformatory decrees of Basle, and, following the example of the French assembly at Bourges, drew up a pragmatic sanction, or royal edict, enforcing their observance. The diet, however, entered its protest against the decree of Basle suspending the Pope from the exercise of his temporal and spiritual authority, and reserved any further proceeding in relation to him to a future œcumenical council.

The Basilians replied that the maintenance of the principle of the superiority of an œcumenical council to the Pope was an essential condition to the safety and well-being of the Church, and that, since Eugene had frequently violated this principle in the past, it would be necessary to again take action against him should he attempt anything of the kind in the future.

A second diet was held *at Mentz*, A. D. 1441, under the Emperor *Frederic III.*, when the papal legates again took up the defence of Eugene, maintaining that his deposition by the Basilians had been irregular: first, because only seven bishops voted in favour of it, whereas the ecclesiastical canons require the unanimous verdict of twelve to depose a simple *bishop;* and secondly, because open and avowed *heresy*[1] is the only crime justifying the deposition of a Pope. Influenced by these considerations, the diet expressed itself in favour of convoking an œcumenical council.

A *diet of princes* was held at Frankfort-on-Main, A. D. 1442, at which *Nicholas de Cusa* again appeared as the advocate of the Pope. What sort of claim, said he, can this pretended Council of Basle lay to the title of œcumenical? Have not its labours tended to destroy such title altogether? Has it not done all in its power to divide the Church, the mystical Body of Christ, by attempting to place the tiara on the head of a layman and a temporal prince?

The reasoning of the cardinal was so conclusive and consistent that *Frederic III.* and the majority of the princes acknowledged the authority of Eugene, thus inflicting a death-blow upon the assembly at Basle, whose dissolution, as has been said, speedily followed.

But Eugene's troubles were not yet over. He was obliged to sustain a fresh struggle with the *diet of the electors*, who *assembled at Frankfort*, in the months of May and September, A. D. 1446.

[1] It is not intended here to imply that the Pope, when teaching the Universal Church, and speaking *ex cathedra*, can, by any possibility, fall into error in treating of faith and morals, or subjects connected with them. If any serious doubt of this proposition was ever entertained, it has been for ever set at rest by the Vatican Council. (I R.)

In the preceding year the Pope had deposed the archbishops and electors of Cologne and Treves, who for a time had observed a neutral policy between the contending parties, but finally took sides with the antipope. Their sees were given to two relatives of the powerful Duke of Burgundy. The diet protested against this proceeding, as an illegal exercise of papal authority, and in consequence drew up four articles, one of which asserted the superiority of an œcumenical council to a Pope, which were presented to Eugene for his signature, with a threat, that, if he should refuse, the diet would declare in favour of the antipope, Felix V. It is evident from this act that the diet, in deciding upon the controversy, was not guided by any principle of justice or sense of duty, but was ready to declare in favour of either claimant who would make the largest concessions.

The Emperor Frederic refused to approve the proceedings of the diet, but consented to send *Æneas Sylvius dei Piccolomini* to represent him in the embassy which had been appointed to go to Rome and confer with the Pope.

At the head of this embassy was the notorious *Gregory of Heimburg*, the syndic of the free city of Nürnberg, who, mistaking boorishness and rudeness for frankness and simplicity, approached the Pope with arrogant assurance, and laid before him the demands of the electors, with the statement that upon his answer would depend the character of the resolutions to be adopted on the reassembling of the diet at Frankfort in the ensuing month of September.[1] Eugene at first refused to treat with him at all, but upon the advice of Æneas Sylvius, promised to send a definite answer to the diet. When the diet assembled in September, A. D. 1446, Æneas Sylvius, who had, during his visit to Rome, become reconciled to Eugene, together with the papal legate, *Thomas of Sarzano*, Bishop of Bologna, a man of even temper and gentle disposition, lately created cardinal by Eugene, and his colleagues, *Nicholas de Cusa* and the Spanish *Carvajal*, succeeded in bringing about an understanding between the electors and the Pope. The document setting forth the conditions of agreement is known as the "*Concordat of the Princes.*"[2]

The princes admitted that a profession of neutrality in matters of faith was something entirely unheard-of among Christians, and they accordingly disclaimed any such position. This peace, which was indeed no more than a compromise based upon mutual concessions, was confirmed by Pope Eugene in four separate bulls issued shortly before his death, which occurred February 23, A. D. 1447. But while thus

[1] Concerning Gregory of Heimburg, conf. †*Düx*, Nich. de Cusa, in several places, and in the *Freiburg* Cyclopædia, Vol. IV., pp. 733-736; French transl., Vol. 10, pp. 109-112; *Brockhaus*, Gregory of Heimburg, being a contribution towards the Hist. of Germany during the fifteenth century, Lps., 1861.

[2] Concordata Principum, in *Horix*, Concordata Nat. Germ. integra, Frcf. et Lps., ed. II., 1772 sq., T. I. Eugene's bulls, in *C. W. Koch*, Sanctio pragmatica Germanor. illustrata. Argent., 1789, 4to, with the Syllogedocumentorum, in *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., pp. 97-114. Conf. *Æneæ Sylv.*, Hist. *in Koch*, pp. 301-309, and *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1447, nro. 4 sq.; above all, see *Scharpff*, Nicol. de Cusa, Pt. I., pp. 144-147.

ratifying the action of the diet, Eugene was careful to guard the rights of the Church, by issuing another bull about the same time containing a proviso, the effect of which was to make the ratification of the concordat between the Holy See and the Germans conditional. In this bull Eugene expressly stated that, should the concordat be found to contain any article injurious to the Church, such article should be regarded, and was declared to be, null and void. Eugene was led to take this prudential measure by the representations of some of the cardinals, who expressed a fear that the articles of the concordat might be found to restrict too much the liberty of the Holy See. Thomas of Sarzano, Bishop of Bologna, was chosen to succeed to Eugene, and took the name of *Nicholas V.* (A. D. 1447-1455.) Being a man of liberal tastes, a strong advocate of the revival of classic literature and Christian antiquities, and the founder of the Vatican library,[1] he commanded universal respect, and was shortly recognized by the whole Catholic world as the true Pope. Even the antipope, Felix V., was persuaded to resign his supposed claims to the papal dignity, and, in the year 1449, submitted to the obedience of Nicholas.

The Basilians, some of whom still continued the pretence of holding a council, having, under threat of Frederic III., been driven out of Basle, and withdrawn to Lausanne, seeing themselves deserted on all hands, resolved to die as they had lived, and their last acts consisted in the magnanimous approval of papal conduct which they had no longer the power to resist. After having generously removed all the censures they had passed during the continuance of the schism, they accepted the resignation of Felix, and, as if there existed no Pope, very prudently declared Nicholas the object of their choice.

The newly-elected Pope, being a man of a conciliatory disposition and a lover of peace, succeeded in bringing about an accommodation between Germany and the Holy See. He declared, with commendable candour, that though the Council of Basle had attempted to strip the Holy See of its undoubted rights, it could not be denied that the excessive use of papal power in restricting the exercise of episcopal authority had given the Fathers reasonable ground for complaint, and that this should be taken into account as an extenuating circumstance in forming a judgment upon their extreme measures.

A separate treaty, known as the "*Concordat of Aschaffenburg*,"[2] and entered upon the statute-book of the empire under this name, was made at Vienna, February 17, A. D. 1448, between the papal legate, Cardinal Carvajal, on the part of the Pope and the Emperor Frederic. In this it was stipulated that the reformatory decrees of Basle, which Eugene had accepted upon certain conditions, should not be considered as binding; that the Holy See should enjoy a more ample jurisdiction in conferring high ecclesiastical dignities, and that

[1] *Janotti Manetti*, Vita Nicol. V. (*Muratori*, T. III., P. II., p. 905 sq.) *Georgii*, Vita Nicol. V., Ad fidem vett. monument., Rom., 1742, 4to. *Papencordt*, L. c., p. 482 sq. and 499 sq.; *Reumont*, III. 1, pp. 110-126; *Gregorovius*, Vol. VII., pp. 100-146.

[2] In *Würdtwein*, Subsid. diplom., T. IX., nro. 9, p. 78, and in *Koch*, p. 201 sq.

a moderate fixed tax should take the place of the annats formerly paid to the Pope when benefices were conferred.

Notwithstanding the attachment of France to the cause of Eugene, the diet of *Bourges*, held A. D. 1438, accepted the reformatory decrees of Basle, alleging that their provisions were specially applicable to the condition of the Church in that country, and enforced their observance in a document consisting of twenty-three articles, and known as the *Pragmatic Sanction*.[1] To give it an historical basis, the supposed *Sanctio Pragmatica* of King St. Louis was now (first) invoked.[2]

The consequence of this step soon became apparent in the great number of appeals (*appellatio tanquam ab abusu*) from ecclesiastical authority to the national parliament. So numerous and vexatious did these become, that Charles VII. and Louis XI. were forced to restrict them; and even *Fleury*, Gallican as he was, said, "that these appeals, in *spiritual* affairs, from ecclesiastical to civil authority, instead of being regarded as among the liberties of the Gallican Church, should be looked upon rather as a mark of her *servitude*."

Nicholas had published, A. D. 1453, a general crusade against the Turks, who were threatening Constantinople, and his last hours were embittered by the news that the city had fallen into their hands. He had sent a fleet, under the command of the Archbishop of Ragusa, to the aid of the Greeks; which, unfortunately, did not arrive at its destination until after the city had been taken, May 29, A. D. 1453. When he was at the point of death, he said: "When I was Thomas Sarzano, I had more joy in a single day than now in a whole year." Nicholas died, A. D. 1455.

C.—THE LAST POPES OF THIS PERIOD—FIFTH COUNCIL OF LATERAN.

The biographies by *Platina*, continued from Sixtus IV. to Pius V., by the Augustinian, *F. Onofrio Panvinio* († 1568), Ven., 1594 and 1703. *Steph. Infessura* (chancellor at Rome, about 1494), Diarium Romanæ urbis 1294-1494 (*Eccard.*, T. II., incomplete, in *Muratori*, T. III., P. II., p. 1109 sq.) *Jac. Volaterrani*, Diarium Rom. (1474-1484), in *Murat.*, T. XXIII., p. 86 sq. Hist. of the City of Rome, by *Papencordt*, p. 486 sq.; by *Gregorovius*, Vol. VII., p. 146; by *Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 126 sq.

§ 273. *Calixtus III.* (A. D. 1455-1458—*Pius II.* (A. D. 1458-1464)—*Paul II.* (A. D. 1464-1471)—*Sixtus IV.* (A. D. 1471-1484)—*Innocent VIII.* (A. D. 1484-1492)—*Alexander VI.* (A. D. 1492-1503).

The Popes, who alone, at this time, seemed to have any concern for the welfare of the Church and the safety of Christendom, appealed to the princes of Europe in favour of a crusade to repel the encroachments of the Turks. No one was found to answer to their call. Selfish interests had stifled every generous impulse, and the noble enthusiasm of former days had died away amid the sluggish indolence of the age.

[1] Histoire de la sanction pragmatique (Traités des droits et libertés de l'église Gallicane, Paris, 1731 f. *Phillips*, C. L., Vol. III., p. 327. *Freiburg* Cyclopædia, Vol. VIII., p. 638 sq.; French transl., Vol. 19, p. 5, art. Pragmatique Sanction).

[2] See Vol. II., p. 432.

Every thought seemed fixed upon the present; no one looked beyond himself or out into the future. Hungary and Poland were seriously threatened. The latter revived again the gallantry and heroism of the crusaders, and bearing aloft the standard of the Cross, on which was inscribed the legend, "Onward for the Faith ("*Wiara Naprzod*"), they threw themselves, with the *magnanimous devotion* of heroes, against the approaching tide of the Turks.

Nicholas V. was succeeded by Cardinal Alphonsus Borgia, a *Spaniard*, who took the name of Calixtus III. St. Vincent Ferrer had foretold the elevation of Alphonsus, who, in consequence, while still a cardinal, bound himself by vow to put forth every energy, when he should have succeeded to the papal throne, to wrest Constantinople from the dominion of the Turks. Hence, with the aid of the princes of Europe, he raised and supplied an army to be sent against the Turks, which contributed materially to the great victory gained by the Christians at Belgrade.[1] That the undertaking might have a happy issue, he was accustomed to assemble the faithful by the ringing of the Angelus every day at noon, to implore the aid of the God of battles.

Calixtus was also a man of cultivated mind and refined tastes, a lover of both Christian and Pagan literature, and, continuing the work commenced by his predecessor, is justly regarded as sharing with him the honour of having founded the Vatican library.

The literary treasures of Greece were brought to the West by such men as Theodore Gaza of Thessalonica, Chalcondyles of Athens, George of Trebizond, John Argyropulus, and Gemistius Pletho of Constantinople, all among the most distinguished scholars of that age.

It is to be regretted that Calixtus left a stain upon his otherwise unblemished reputation by creating two of his nephews cardinals on the same day, and a third, Duke of Spoleto and Governor of the Castle of St. Angelo, all of whom were worthless, especially *Rodrigo Borgia*, and possessed no merit entitling them to such honour. Neither were there wanting those who attributed the Pope's opposition to the succession of Ferdinand of Aragon to the crown of Naples, whose claims Eugene IV. had already acknowledged, to his desire to have the Duke of Spoleto succeed to that dignity.

The College of Cardinals went into conclave upon the death of Calixtus, but before proceeding to an election they thought it obligatory upon them, in face of these abuses, to bind themselves severally by oath to the observance of such restrictions of the papal prerogatives as would insure their correction. Their choice fell upon *Æneas Sylvius*, the spirited historian of the Council of Basle, whose life is a striking illustration of the freaks of fortune, and the strange vicissi-

[1] *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1375 sq. *A. Menzel*, Hist. of the Germans, Vol. VI., p. 241 sq., says: "That anything at all was done against the Turks is *wholly due to the exertions of the Pope*, and to him is to be given the credit of the *great battle of deliverance*, near Belgrade (July 22, 1456), gained by the efforts of his legates and crusaders," &c.

tudes of human affairs. Born at Corsignano, whither his father had been exiled, and descended from the noble, but now reduced house of *Piccolomini* of Siena, he was unable to enter upon his studies until his eighteenth year. But, gifted with a fine mind, he soon became distinguished for the elegance of his Latinity, the grace and spirit of his poetry, and the success with which he pursued his studies in jurisprudence. He next took a position as secretary under Capranica, Bishop of Fermo, one of the opponents of Pope Eugene, whom he accompanied to the Council of Basle, where he shortly made an able address, opposing the transference of the Council to any other city. As a reward for this speech he was promoted to the office of recorder of the Council. He was also frequently sent on important embassies, during some of which he was not over discreet in his conduct. He fell in with an Englishwoman at Strasburg, by whom he had a son—a fact which he quietly communicated to his father without any attempt at exculpation other than a reference to the examples of David and Solomon.[1]

After the Council had been transferred he entered the service of Felix V., the antipope, as secretary, and during this time wrote his "*Commentarius de rebus Basileæ gestis.*"

In the year 1442, he was sent on an embassy to the diet of Frankfort, and while there was crowned *poet laureate*, by the Emperor *Frederic III.*, under whom he took the position of secretary in the imperial chancery, and from this time forward entirely abandoned the cause of the antipope.

During his stay at Rome, whither he was sent by Frederic III., A. D., 1445, to urge the convocation of an œcumenical council, he received full pardon for his past opposition to the Holy See and was reconciled to Pope Eugene. He was now admitted to *priests' orders*, and proved a very efficient agent in adjusting the differences between the Pope and the emperor.

Warned by a painful malady of the emptiness of all earthly ambition, he began to take a serious view of life. "The sum of all knowledge," said he, "is to know how to die, and, if one have not this, his past life, though in other respects without blame, has been to no purpose."

He was raised to the bishopric of *Trieste*, by Nicholas V., successor to Eugene; transferred to the See of *Siena*, and thence to that of *Ermeland*, and created *Cardinal* by Calixtus III. But before having entered upon his *duties* in the *last-named see*, he was called to fill the chair of Peter, and took the name of *Pius II.*[2]

He displayed great energy and zeal in his attempts to rescue

[1] Ep. 15.

[2] *Ant. Campani*, Vita Pii II. (*Muratori*, T. III., Pt. II., p. 965.) Conf. also *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1389 sq. *Scharpff*, L. 1., pp. 268-305. On the efforts of Pius II. for the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, see *Schroeckh*, Ch. Hist., Pt. XXXII., pp. 280-289. *Hagenbach*, Reminiscence of Æneas Sylvius, Basle, 1840. *Voigt*, Enea Silvio as Pope Pius II., Berlin, 1856 sq., 3 vols., and in *Düx*, Nich. of Cusa, in many places. *Reumont* Vol. III., 1. pp. 129-152. *Gregorovius*, Vol. II., pp. 156-210.

Europe from the yoke of the Turk. The better to inspire the faithful with the gravity of their danger and to stimulate them to noble exertions in averting it, he convoked an assembly of the European powers, to be held at *Mantua*, A. D. 1459. But the result did not answer his expectations. Frederic III., who should have led the movement, was engaged in an attempt to seize the crown of Hungary, the very country that formed the bulwark of defence against the threatened invasions of the East, and Pius II. found at Mantua only a few Italian princes, and some ambassadors from the trans-alpine courts. An instruction addressed by the Pope to the Sultan Mohammed, in the hope of persuading that prince of the truth of Christianity, was equally unsuccessful.

It is believed that Pius II. suggested to *Nicholas de Cusa* the idea of writing his work "*De pace sive Concordantia Fidei*," the aim of which was to inspire the Mohammedans with a favourable idea of Christianity. "The time must come," says the pious author, in a burst of enthusiasm at the close of his work, "the time must come when the faith of Christ shall reign supreme, because He alone gives salvation, happiness, and life. Be thou, then, O Calif, converted to Him, and thy subjects will follow thy illustrious example."

Pius II., believing that if the princes of Europe beheld the Father and Teacher of Christendom, bowed with age and sinking under infirmity, leading the way at the head of an army against the Turks, they, too, roused to generous purpose by so inspiring a sight, would gallantly come forward in defence of the common cause, set out from Rome to Ancona, where the Venetian fleet awaited him.[1] But the fatigues of the journey, and the distress at seeing his efforts so poorly seconded, hastened his death, which occurred August 14, A. D. 1464.

He was thus unfortunately prevented from carrying out those *general reforms* within the Church, which Nicholas de Cusa had pointed out with rare foresight and ability.

Pius II., like St. Augustine, withdrew, in his "*Bulla Retractationum*," the erroneous opinions which he had held on papal authority in the early part of his life, and which he had defended at the Council at Basle. "In my youth," said he, "I was led astray and in ignorance, and, like St. Paul of old, persecuted the Church of God and the Apostolic See. Some, indeed, may now say, 'Æneas, who afterwards became Pope, wrote thus and thus,' and may fancy that Pius II. and the Holy See now approve what Æneas then wrote. *Let them*, therefore, *regard those early writings as of no consequence, and believe what Æneas now teaches*, that the Pope, receiving the plenitude of authority over the whole Church immediately from Jesus Christ, confers all power possessed by the other members of the body ecclesiastic."

Owing to the long continuance of the schism, and the consequent tendency to circumscribe the authority of the Holy See, the practice of appealing from the decision of the Pope to the judgment of an

[1] Cf. *Heinemann*, Æn. Sylv. as preacher of a crusade against the Turks, Bernburg, 1855.

œcumenical council had become common, and this abuse Pius II. determined to correct. In his bull "*Exsecrabilis*," he forbade all such appeals under pain of excommunication. It was found impossible to give to this bull the force of law in France, as the French parliament refused to allow Louis XI. to set aside the *Pragmatic Sanction* of Bourges.

Notwithstanding that the so-called capitulation oath, which *Paul II.*, the new Pope, a nephew of Eugene IV., had taken previously to his election, was one of unprecedented rigour, still, acting on the counsel of several eminent jurists, he resolved to entirely disregard the obligation under which it placed him. His love of display was so great, and his prodigality so excessive, that his legitimate revenue was found insufficient to meet his expenditures, and a tax was accordingly laid upon other churches, and the old abuses in the conferring of benefices again revived. He moreover laid himself open to the charge of nepotism, by raising three of his nephews to the dignity of the cardinalate.

On the other hand, Paul II., who, with admirable foresight, perceived that the excessive cultivation of Pagan literature and science, which was now becoming fashionable, if allowed to go on, would eventually be the source of great evil, set himself to resolutely oppose the tendency, which he characterized as a straying from the true faith. He also abolished the Court of Abbreviatori, on account of the notorious corruption which prevailed among its members. This court had been established by his predecessor, Pius II., and consisted of officers who prepared the bulls on the collation of benefices. Many of these were literary men and members of the academy that had been founded by the famous *Pomponio Leto*, a former pupil of Lorenzo Valla, for the revival of ancient classical literature, in the prosecution of which they went to the length of introducing Pagan rites and ceremonies. They were arrested A. D. 1468, on suspicion of being implicated in a conspiracy against the Pope, and on a charge of apostasy from the faith; but, having been shortly afterwards released, they again opened the academy. *Platina*, who had been among those put under arrest, took ample revenge on Paul for any wrongs he may have suffered, in a biography which he wrote of that pontiff, and to be found among his *Lives of the Popes*.[1]

Upon the death of Paul (A. D. 1471), a season of exceptional humiliation opened upon the papacy. It began with the pontificate of Cardinal Francesco della Rovere of Savona, formerly a professor of theology and general of the Franciscan Order, who ascended the papal throne, August 25, A. D. 1471, under the name of *Sixtus IV.*

It is difficult to determine whether his vices or his virtues were

[1] *Pauli II.*, Vita (by Cannese), præmissis ejus vindiciis adv. Platinam aliosque obtrectatores, ed. Quirini, Rom., 1740, 4to. *Caspar. Veronens.*, De gestis Pauli II. (*Muratori*, T. III., P. II., p. 1025.) Important documents for the history of the reign of Paul II. are: *Jacob. Piccolominei* Cardinal. Papiens. († 1479), rerum suo tempore gestarum commentarii libb. VII. (from 1464-1469), cum ejusd. epistol., Mediol., 1506 f.; *Gobellini*, Comment., Frcf., 1614, p. 348 sq.

more prominent. The former are chiefly to be ascribed to his desire of accomplishing great actions, and to his ambition to rule, for which he possessed eminent talents. He considerably enlarged the Vatican library, and appointed the learned *Platina* to the office of librarian; built, besides several other churches, those of Sta. Maria del Popolo and della Pace, and the *Sixtine Chapel*, which Ghirlandaio, Perugino, Michel Angelo, Rafaello, and others were engaged to fresco; adorned Rome with a number of magnificent public structures, placed Bonaventura on the catalogue of saints; was a munificent patron of literature; did all in his power to put an end to the controversies between the Thomists and the Scotists; and, immediately after his accession, invited all Christian princes to an *œcumenical council*, to be held in the Lateran palace, where they might adjust their difficulties and part in peace. But these refused to obey his call.

On the other hand, he had scarcely entered upon the duties of his office when he raised two of his nephews, Pietro Riario and Rafaello Sansoni, to the rank of the cardinalate, and attempted to establish a principality in the Romagna for a third—Girolamo Riario—who had not entered the ecclesiastical state.

His political efforts were directed particularly against the *Florentines*, who had taken sides with Vitelli, Lord of Città di Castello, in his conflict with Sixtus; and against the Medici, who had refused to recognize Francesco dei Salviati as Archbishop of Pisa, to which see he had been appointed by the Pope.

Sixtus took revenge on his enemies for these acts of hostility by tendering the support of himself and his nephew, Girolamo, to the house of Pazzi, now engaged in a conspiracy against that of the Medici, stipulating, however, that this should be attended with no bloodshed. Lorenzo dei Medici and his brother, Giuliano, were seized and condemned to death, but the former was fortunate enough to make his escape, and thus frustrated the designs of the conspirators. These latter, together with the Archbishop of Pisa, were at once put under arrest, condemned, and put to death. This act was followed by a bull, in which Sixtus, after enumerating the crimes of Lorenzo dei Medici and the other officers of the republic, declared them destitute of all sense of honour and justice, and their children incapacitated to enter upon the ecclesiastical state; and placed the dioceses of Florence, Fiesole, and Pistoja under interdict.

The Florentines paid little attention to the papal bull. Acting on the advice of some learned jurists, they appealed to a future œcumenical council; and, through the intervention of Louis XI. of France, who threatened Sixtus with a revival of the Pragmatic Sanction if he should persist in keeping the city under interdict, obtained a full release from the censures, A. D. 1480, but not till after they had expressed their sorrow for the execution of the ecclesiastics who had taken part in the conspiracy.

The terror which the taking of Otranto by the Turks (August 11, 1480) had spread throughout all Italy, disposed the Pope to hasten to

make peace with his enemies.[1] Sixtus was also engaged in quarrels with the *Venetians*, and in consequence, in the year 1483, passed sentence of excommunication upon the doge and the other magistrates of that republic. But they, too, like the Florentines, appealed from this sentence to a future council, commanded the ecclesiastics within their dominions to continue religious service as usual, and sent those who disobeyed it into exile.

These continual wars had exhausted the papal treasury, and the Pope, in order to replenish it, put ecclesiastical dignities on sale, and carried on a shameless traffic in taxes and other revenues, thus making the Roman court an object of universal contempt and execration.

His policy at home was equally unfortunate with that abroad. The two rival parties at Rome were represented by the house of the Orsini on the one side, and on the other by those of the Colonnas and Savelli, with the former of which the Pope and his nephew had taken sides. The arrest and imprisonment of two cardinals belonging to the two latter houses, by the Pope's order, so incensed the Romans that they broke out into open revolt.

Sixtus died August 12, A. D. 1484, in the seventy-second year of his age, and so generally detested was he, that a contemporary writer said of him, on the day of his death: "To-day has God delivered his people from the power of this unjust man, who, destitute alike of the fear of God and the love of his fellow-men, sought only the gratification of his avarice and ambition."

Recourse was again had, for the third time, to the *capitulation oath*,[2] to prevent the repetition of so scandalous a pontificate. It would seem that the cardinals should have been taught by past experience that the restrictions of any such covenant, no matter with what circumstance and solemnity it might have been entered into, could, under specious pretexts, be easily set aside, and that the only effective way of providing a remedy adequate to the existing evils was to make choice of a man to fill the papal throne whose past life would be a guarantee for his future good conduct. After the usual promises had been given, the cardinals proceeded to an election, and their choice fell upon the decrepit old man, Cardinal John Baptist Cibo (Κυβος), a Genoese, who took the name of *Innocent VIII.* In his youth he had had a number of natural children, though, according to the account of *Ciacomo*, he was afterwards married, and, on the death of his wife, entered the ecclesiastical state. He was appointed to the bishopric of Savona by Paul II., and by Sixtus IV. created domestic prelate and cardinal. While Pope, he managed to make comfortable provision for his two surviving children, Franceschetto and Theodorina, the latter of whom he gave in marriage to a Genoese, and

[1] His Life, written by *F. Onofrio Panvinio.* (Tr.) (*Muratori*, T. III., Pt. II., p. 1052); his theological treatises, Rome, 1470-71; Nor., 1473. *Reumont*, Vol. III., 1, pp. 161-184. *Gregorovius*, Vol. VII., pp. 232-274.

[2] Cf. *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1484, nro. 28 sq. *Reumont*, Vol. III., 1, pp. 187-198. *Gregorovius*, Vol. VII., pp. 275-308.

for the former procured Maddalena, the daughter of Lorenzo dei Medici.

Innocent, though a man of pacific disposition, and frequently allowing his love of peace to betray him into acts of weakness and indecision, found himself engaged in a war with Ferdinand of Aragon, King of Naples, which was not brought to a final close until the year 1492. The Pope, in need of some support in Italy, entered into an alliance with Lorenzo dei Medici, the man who had so bitterly opposed the preceding Pope, but whose son, Giovanni, Innocent now created cardinal, notwithstanding that he was only a boy of thirteen, and had already been invested with twenty-nine ecclesiastical benefices.

The affairs of the East early began to seriously engage the attention of Innocent. Following the example of his predecessors, he called upon Christian princes and peoples to undertake a fresh crusade against the Turks.[1] He also succeeded in bringing about a reconciliation between the rival houses of the Colonnas and the Orsini at Rome, thus putting an end to the disgraceful scenes consequent upon their rivalries, and for this office he received from the Romans the honourable title of the Father of his Country.

The Grand Master of the Knights of St. John had given Dshem, a younger brother and rival of *Bajazet II.*, into the custody of the Pope, who hoped that this prince might be of important service to the Christian cause in the contemplated eastern war.

Bajazet II. paid the Pope annually forty thousand florins for keeping this prince in prison; and, though the transaction may, at first sight, be regarded as a venal service, a just appreciation of all the circumstances involved will lead the fair-minded reader to put quite a different estimate upon it. Innocent, like his predecessors, invented new means of extorting money from the churches to fill his depleted treasury. The decrees of Constance and Basle were either entirely forgotten or lost sight of; ecclesiastical affairs were esteemed of little consequence, and artists and savans seemed to have taken the place of ecclesiastics. This Pope, however, deserves considerable credit for his energetic efforts to suppress sorcery and witchcraft and the remnants of the heresy of John Huss.[2] He died July 25, A. D. 1492.[3]

On the 11th of the following August, fifteen of the twenty-three

[1] *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1484, nro. 60 sq.; an. 1485, nro. 1 sq.; an. 1486, nro. 60 sq.; an. 1488, nro. 10 sq.

[2] Ibid., Ad. an. 1488, nro. 58.

[3] The following biographies of Innocent VIII. are extant: 1. By an anonymous contemporary, in the Diario di Roma dell' anno 1481-92, in *Muratori*, III. 2, p. 1070 sq.; 2. By *Infessura*, in the Diarium Romanæ urbis, ibid., p. 1189 sq.; 3. By *Onuphrius Panvinius*, in the continuation of Platina; 4. By *Raphael Volaterranus*, in Geographia, lib. XXII., and by *James Volaterranus*, in the Diarium Rom. (1471-84), in *Muratori*, T. XXIII., p. 86 sq.; 5. By *Vilardi*, Vita d'Innocenzo VIII., Venez., 1613; and, 6. In *Pallatii*, Gesta Rom. Pontif. III., 685 sq., in *Ciaconii*, Vitæ et Gesta Rom. Pontif. III., 89 sq.

cardinals who met in conclave, possessing a full knowledge of what they were about to do, and free from all external influence or constraint, if we except the money that was used to purchase their votes, chose Cardinal Roderigo Borgia, a Spaniard, to succeed to Innocent.[1] As Pope, he took the name of *Alexander VI.* He had already reached his sixty-first year. He was equally conspicuous for vices and virtues; was gifted with fine talents, and was a generous patron of the arts and sciences; was bold in conception, fearless in execution, and undaunted in the presence of danger; kind and affable to the poor and middle classes, harsh and arrogant to the rich and powerful; and, once he had made up his mind to accomplish a purpose, was unscrupulous as to the means to be employed.[2] After he had completed his studies he gained some distinction as an orator at the bar, but shortly gave up any ambition he may have entertained in this direction, to enter upon the more brilliant career of a military life. But when Calixtus III., his maternal uncle, became Pope, Roderigo was

[1] This venality is severely censured by *Raynaldus*, Ad an. 1492: "Suffragia turpi sacrilegio vendidere Borgiæ cardinales."

[2] *Burchardi*, Diarium curiæ Rom. sub. Alex. VI., 1484-1506 (*Eccardi*, Corpus hist., T. II., p. 2017 sq. Less complete in the specimen hist. arcanæ seu anecdota de vita Alex. VI., ed. *Leibnit.*, Han., 1696, 4to; more complete and enlarged in the ed. *Genarelli*, Flor., 1854 sq.). See below, p. 71, note 2. *Guicciardini*, L. c., lib. I.-VI. *Raphael Volaterranus*, in his Anthropologia, lib. XXII., thus characterizes this Pope: "In Alexandro, ut de Annibale Livius scribit, æquabant vitia *virtutes*. Inerat namque ingenium, ratio," etc. Against the representations, either wholly false or greatly exaggerated, of the suspected *Burchard*, and of *Pontanus*, *Sannazar*, *Giovio*, and *Guicciardini*, the first to protest was an Englishman, *Wm. Roscoe*, the eminent historian of Lorenzo de' Medici, in his second great work, "*The Life and Pontificate of Leo X.*," which first appeared in 1805, passed rapidly through several editions, and, like his former work, was translated into French and Italian, and into German by *Glaser*, Vienna, 1818, 3 pts. (see especially Pt. I., ch. 3-6). Next came *Capefigue*, L'eglise pendant les quatre derniers siècles, T. I., pp. 41-46; *Chantrel*, Le pape Alexander VI., ed. II., Paris, 1864. These latter writers, however, were preceded by *Abbé Rohrbacher*, Hist. univ. de l'eglise catholique 2ème ed. Vol. XXII., p. 338-354; and the writer of the article Alexander VI., in the *Dict. des papes* par *M. C. F. Chevé*, who says: "The more attentively and thoroughly the original documents of the history of that epoch are studied, the more clear will it become that the memory of Alexander VI. has been fearfully calumniated. To pass an unbiassed judgment upon his life, it will be especially necessary to take into account his social surroundings. True criticism has long since cleared the name of Alexander VI. of the charges of poisoning and the other horrible crimes that had been groundlessly imputed to him by the revengeful journalists of the ante-room and the scandal-mongers of that age and country. The implacable hostility of the Reformers, and the resentment of France because of the political attitude of Alexander VI., have also contributed not a little to blacken his memory. It is not our purpose to excuse the irregularities of his life, but we would invite the reader desirous of learning to what extent he has been defamed to peruse the chapter devoted to him by *M. Audin* (Hist. de Léon X., T. I., c. 2). He was charitable, energetic, fair-minded, and moderate. If he incurred so much ill-will, it is because he overcame and kept in check the feudal aristocracy of Rome." His life has been exhaustively written by *Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., and by *Gregorovius*, Vol. VII. *Grœne*, in his Hist. of the Popes, Vol. II., p. 294-316, has "*attempted*" to prove that *Juan de Borgia*, Duke of Gandia, and *Cæsar*, were his nephews, and *Lucrezia* his niece; but *Reumont* (Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 204), and *Gregorovius* (Vol. VII., p. 317), whose statements are derived from authentic sources, maintain that they were the natural children of Roderigo Borgia, and that the latter acknowledged them as such. Gregorovius, however, following the epitaph of *Vanozza* in the Church Sta. Maria del Popolo in Rome, states that Cæsar Borgia was the *elder*, and Juan, Duke of Gandia, the *younger* son of Alexander

called to Rome, and having taken orders, was, in his twenty-fifth year, appointed to the archiepiscopal see of Valencia, and created Cardinal-deacon and Vice-Chancellor of the Roman Church (A. D. 1456). Later on, Sixtus IV. created him Cardinal-Bishop of Albano and Porto.

By contemporary writers, whose accounts are *sometimes conflicting*, he is represented as having carried on a secret intrigue with the noble Lady Vanozza de' Catanei, who had already been twice married, by whom he had four sons and one daughter. It is said that his relations with this lady were kept so secret that the knowledge of them was confined to a few, and that his grave demeanour, his simulated piety, and his profuse liberality, made him popular with the people.

Some of the cardinals, it is alleged, were deceived by these external evidences of sanctity, others were probably bribed, and both together placed Roderigo on the papal throne. There is certainly some truth in these assertions; for when his election became known, the Roman people gave expression to their joy and intense worldly-mindedness on the spur of the moment in an improvised address.[1]

The frivolity and questionable tone of morals which prevailed at the Papal Court after Alexander had become Pope, and which, if he did not openly encourage, he was at no great pains to correct, gave an opportunity to his many enemies to spread all sorts of scandalous stories, and to indulge in the most extravagant exaggerations. He did indeed greatly abuse his power to secure positions of profit and honour for his children.[2] He created his eldest son, *Juan*, Duke of Gandia, and fixed upon him many estates in the kingdom of Naples; he also bestowed upon him the Duchy of Benevento, which he had detached from the States of the Church.

In his endeavours to provide equally well for his two younger sons, *Cæsar* and *Juffré*, and his daughter, *Lucrezia*, he had recourse to a policy at once dishonest and dishonourable. This was especially conspicuous in his conduct towards *Charles VIII.*, King of France, who came into Italy to defend the claims of the house of Anjou to the kingdom of Naples. Alexander, bribed by *Ferdinand*, King of Naples, espoused his cause, and after his death, which occurred January 25, A. D. 1494, was equally zealous in his advocacy of the rights of his son, *Alphonsus II.*

But when Charles VIII., entirely disregarding the excommuni-

[1] Cæsare magna fuit, nunc Roma est maxima. Sextus
Regnat Alexander. Ille vir, iste Deus!

[2] The mawkish sentimentality of Alexander in regard to his children was especially manifest when, in giving away his daughter Lucrezia for the last time in marriage, he said to the ambassadors of the Duke of Ferrara, pointing to her donation of jewellery: "This is all for Lucrezia. It is my wish that she should possess finer pearls and a larger quantity of them than any princess of Italy." (*Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 239.) And, hearing of the death of his eldest son, Juan, he said: "Had I seven popedoms, I should gladly give them all for the life of my son." (*Gregorovius*, L. c., Vol. VII., p. 402 sq.) In a letter of recommendation to Louis XII., King of France, he called Cæsar "the dearest object he had on earth." (*Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 228).

cation that Alexander had published against him, entered Rome at the head of his army, on the last day of the year, the Pope hastened to make terms with the victor, and thus facilitated the conquest of Naples, which soon followed.

In the following year Alexander concluded a fresh alliance with the Emperor of Germany and the King of Spain, the Doge of Venice, and Duke Sforza of Milan, for the expulsion of the French from Italy. Charles, unable to make head against this formidable coalition, withdrew in haste across the Alps.

By such dishonourable conduct Alexander set the example to the other princes of calling in foreign powers to settle the difficulties of Italy. The theocratic principle of the Popes of the Middle Ages was now superseded by a selfish policy and the lust of dominion.

Alexander and his infamous son, *Cæsar Borgia*, relieved of the presence of the French monarch, set about ridding the States of the Church of the independent vicars and petty tyrants by whom they were infested, reopened the courts of judicature, and restored commerce and industry. The boundless exactions of Cæsar Borgia soon led to fresh complications and hostilities between Alexander and the new King of Naples, *Frederic*, the brother of Alphonsus II.

Those cardinals who had opposed the election of Alexander fled from his vengeance, and most of those who had sold their votes to him were arrested on suspicion of being his secret enemies, and were either murdered, imprisoned, or obliged to seek safety in flight.

On the death of his eldest son *Juan*, Duke of Gandia, whose murder the jealous Cæsar Borgia is represented as having been instrumental in bringing about, Alexander showed some disposition to mend his ways, and even expressed an intention of resigning the papacy.[1] But this penitent state of mind gradually wore away as time and care rendered less distinct and horrid the terrible tragedy that had inspired it.

Cæsar Borgia had entered the ecclesiastical state, and had been created cardinal; but now that his brother was dead, Alexander dispensed him from any obligation his former condition imposed upon him, and transferred to him the titles and estates of Juan.

Louis XII. had ascended the throne of France in the year 1498, and in gratitude for a favour conferred upon him by Alexander, created Cæsar Borgia Duke of Valentinois, and gave him a French princess and a relative of his own in marriage. The Pope, feeling himself safe in so powerful an alliance, secured for his son the principality of the Romagna, of which he created him duke. He also subsequently gave large tracts of territory to the two sons of Lucrezia by her second husband, Alphonsus, who had been murdered by Cæsar.[2]

Alexander has been accused of having lived in incest with his daughter Lucrezia,[3] who was thrice married. But this is a malicious

[1] Cf. *Gregorovius*, L. c., Vol. VII., p. 402 sq.

[2] *Gregorovius* VII., p. 156; *Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 238.

[3] *Mr. Roscoe*, in his "Dissertation on the Character of Lucrezia Borgia," says: "With

fabrication. After she had withdrawn from the allurements of Roman society, whose evil influence did so much to corrupt her own and after ages, she devoted herself to a life of sincere piety and to works of Christian charity and mercy.[1] No less false is the slander of his having, in virtue of an alliance with the Sultan, caused the poisoning of the young Prince Dshem, who, as has been stated, had been given into the custody of Innocent VIII. by the Knights of St. John. These outrageous charges are now generally regarded as atrocious columnies. But as *Reumont* justly remarks, the fact that most scandalous reports should have been believed by members of his palace, is a strong argument against his innocence.

The severe *censorship*[2] which Alexander exercised with regard to all publications, would seem to strengthen the suspicion that he had a dread of public opinion.

The great popular orator of Florence, *Jerome Savonarola*, of the Order of Friars Preachers, came forth like another Elias, and hurled the thunders of his eloquence against the abuses of Alexander, and called upon the princes of Christendom to convoke an œcumenical council to depose him. An advocate of democratic principles, he alienated the affections of the people from their rulers, excited them to revolt, and finally himself fell a victim to the storm which he had evoked, but which he was powerless to check. After the Medici had been driven from Florence, Savonarola framed a constitution for the government of the city on the model of that of Venice. One of its articles provided that a person condemned to death for a political offence, should possess the right of appeal to the Great Council of the nation. Some conspirators under sentence of death claimed this privilege; Savonarola refused their petition, and they were executed. The city was in a wild state of excitement; the laity and secular

respect to the incestuous intercourse, of which she has been so generally accused, the circumstances of her life and conduct afford no evidence." Again, speaking of *Burkhard*, the papal master of ceremonies, the same author remarks: "It is highly important to our present subject to observe, that throughout the whole narrative of this loquacious master of papal ceremonies, who seems on no occasion to have *concealed* what *might disgrace* either his *superiors* or himself, there exists not the *most distant* intimation of that criminal intimacy between Alexander and his daughter, or between her and her brothers, which, if he had known or *suspected* it to have existed, it is not likely, from the tenor of other parts of his narrative, that he would have been inclined to wholly conceal." And speaking of those who celebrated Lucrezia's endowments of mind and beauty of person, Mr. Roscoe says: "If Lucrezia was guilty of the crimes of which she stands accused, the prostitution of her panegyrists is greater than her own;" but, he adds, "of such degradation several of the authors before cited were *incapable*." (Tr.)

[1] Cf. *Reumont*, Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 206; concerning the poor work on Lucrezia by *Gilbert* (German by Regia, Lps., 1870), and the still more wretched lucubration of *Ollivier*, Le pape Alex. VI., Paris, 1870; conf. *Reumont*, in the *Bonn.* Review of Theol. Lit., year 1870, nros. 12 and 18.

[2] *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1501, nro. 36: Inter multiplices nostræ sollicitudinis curas illam imprimis suscipere pro nostro pastorali officio debemus, ut quæ salubria et laudabilia ac catholicæ fidei consona et bonis moribus conformia nostro tempore oriuntur, non solum conserventur et augeantur, verum etiam ad posteros propagentur, et quæ perniciosa, damnabilia et impia sunt, succidantur et radicitus exstirpentur, nec pullulare usquam sinantur, et in agro dominico et vinea Domini Sabaoth duntaxat conseri permittendo, quibus fidelium mentes pasci spiritualiter possint, eradicata zizania et oleastri sterilitate succisa. Cf. *Fessler*, the ecclesiastical prohibition of books, Vienna, 1859.

priests took sides against the religious; the religious were equally defiant, and the pulpits rang with denunciations. Alexander VI., to whom the case had been referred, ordered the Dominican to leave off preaching till the difficulty should be settled, but this the latter obstinately refused to do. He was then brought to trial, found guilty of having published false prophecies, and of being a heretic, a schismatic, and the instigator of popular sedition. He was next handed over to the secular authority, condemned to death, and executed A. D. 1498.[1]

Alexander, towards the close of his life, received a great fright from the falling of the ceiling of his room: an accident by which a number of those present with him at the time were killed and others wounded, and the effects of which, it is supposed, brought on the malignant tertiary fever, of which he died, August 18, A. D. 1503.

The story of his having been poisoned at a banquet by a draught which his son had prepared for one of the cardinals, but which, by mistake, one of the servants waiting at the table, gave to his father, is entirely without foundation.[2]

It is certainly a little remarkable that Alexander, while making so flagrant a misuse of his pontifical power, never lost sight of the essential duties of the Head of the Church, and never compromised either faith or morals in any of the numerous official documents issued by him. As the great St. Leo remarked: "*The dignity of Peter is never entirely obscured, even in one unworthy of being his successor.*"

The most important political act of Alexander's pontificate was the suppression of those great aristocratic houses within the States of the Church, whose lords affected a sovereign independence of all government, and grievously oppressed the people. The Romans, knowing the character of the new Pope, anticipated that he would adopt this policy, and accordingly hailed his accession with joy, giving

[1] *J. Fr. Pici*, Vita Hieron. Savon. (Batesii vit. sel. aliquot viror. Lond., 1681.) *Touron*, Hist. des hommes illustr. de l'Ordre de St. Domin., T. III., p. 571. In recent times Jerome Savonarola has been idealized and poetically transformed in essays and monographies by *Rudelbach*, Jerome Savonarola and his Age, Hamburg, 1835; B. *Meir*, Jerome Savonarola, mostly from manuscript sources, Berlin, 1836. Cf. the *Bonn Periodical*, nro. 27, pp. 127-151. *Villari*, Hist. of Savonarola (Germ. by Berduscher, Lps., 1869).

[2] Thus *Roscoe*, in his life of Leo X., according to *old* traditions (German by Glaser, Vienna ed., Vol. I., p. 352), and from modern investigations. Most of the denunciations, exaggerations, and fabrications against the character of Alexander VI., are to be met with in *Burkhard's Diarium*. He hailed from Strasburg, was master of ceremonies at the Roman court, Bishop of Città Castellana († in Rome, 1505), and was but poorly qualified to be a censor, since *Paris*, likewise master of ceremonies at the papal court, characterizes him in his Diarium Ad an. 1506 as follows: "Non solum non humanus, sed supra omnes bestias bestialissimus, inhumanissimus, invidiosissimus." The text, moreover, of his *Diarium* has undergone very suspicious alterations. It was not until two hundred years after his death that *Leibniz*, from Latin, French, and Italian scraps, composed his work entitled "Specimen historiæ, sive anecdota de vita Alexandri VI. Papæ, seu excerpta ex *diario* Burchardi, edente *G. G. L(eibniz)*, Hanov., 1696, 4to. Then the same was published more fully, but with falsifications, by *Eccard*, in his *Corpus* hist. medii ævi, T. II. (cf. *Bréquigny's* Notices des msc. de la bibliothèque du roi, 1787, p. 74), and was still more enlarged, very recently, by *Gennarrelli*, Burchardi Diarium Innoc. VIII., Alexander VI., Pii III. et Julii II., tempora complectens, Florent., 1854. Cf. *Gams*, in *Möhler's* Ch. Hist., Vol. II., pp. 522-523

expression to their feelings in an inscription which celebrated his praises in fulsome words. They were soon undeceived, and they made ample amends for any excess of praise they may have bestowed upon him, by the acrimonious sarcasm with which they now assailed his character.[1]

§ 274. *Julius II.* (A. D. 1503-1513)—*Synod of Pisa—Fifth Council of Lateran—Leo X.* (A. D. 1513-1521).

Paris de Grassis, Diarium curiæ Rom. (1504-1522), in *Hoffmanni,* Collectio nova script. et monum., T. I., and in *Raynald.,* Lettres du roi Louis XII., et du Card. d'Amboise, Brux., 1712, 4 vols. *Hadrianus Castellens,* Itinerarium Julii. (*Ciaconii,* Vitæ Rom. Pontiff., Lugd., 1663, T. II.)

The cardinals, conscious that the pontifical throne had been greatly dishonoured by preceding popes, sought to restore its ancient glory by the election of a man worthy so great a dignity. This was Francis Piccolomini, a nephew of Pius II., whose name he took as Pope. He was a man of spotless character, possessed great business tact, and was earnestly desirous of restoring the discipline of the Church. But, unfortunately, he had scarcely intimated the noble purposes he had at heart, when he was carried away by death, after a reign of twenty-six days. To a man so full of promise to the Church succeeded one of a very different character. This was Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, a native of Abizal, near Savona, and a nephew of Sixtus IV. Formerly a mariner, he was called by his uncle to ecclesiastical preferment. Created Cardinal of San Pietro in Vincoli, in 1471, he soon became distinguished for his exalted virtue, and particularly for the modesty which was conspicuous in whatever he said or did. Of grave, affable, and refined manners, he won the good-will of all, and his merits were the theme of every tongue. He had enjoyed the favour and confidence, not only of Sixtus IV., but also of Innocent VIII. Owing to an inveterate feud between his own house and that of Alexander VI., he went into voluntary exile in France on the accession of that Pontiff, where he remained ten years. When his hereditary enemy had passed away he was recalled from exile by the announcement that his thirty-seven colleagues assembled in conclave, had, by their unanimous vote, raised him to the papal throne, which he ascended under the name of *Julius II.*, to the great disgust and chagrin of Cæsar Borgia. On receiving news of his election, he cried out: "O Lord, deliver us from the Barbarians!" The energy and vigour of his character seemed to point him out as one well qualified to suppress internal revolt and repel foreign aggression. Had Julius lived in a different age, he would have been nearly, if not quite, as conspicuous for pre-eminence in the spiritual affairs of the Church, as

[1] The Pope was subsequently compared to the tyrants Sextus Tarquinius and Sextus Nero, e. g. in the epigram:—

"Sextus Tarquinius, Sextus Nero, Sextus et ipse;
Semper sub Sextis perdita Roma fuit."

he is now for his stern policy as a ruler. But because he defended, sword in hand, the States of the Church, driven to revolt by the oppression of the fugitive Duke of Valentinois, he appears to superficial observers, and has been frequently represented as more intent upon indulging a passion for war than of providing for the well-being and advancement of the Church. Possessing in an eminent degree the talents of a warrior and the astuteness of a statesman, and determined to defend and extend, if possible, the Papal States, he was constantly occupied planning campaigns, and devising means for freeing Italy from foreign domination—a task to which he devoted the best energies of his life. Italian tyrants trembled before him, for they knew their hour was come.[1]

The warlike character of Julius formed so glaring a contrast to the pacific character of his office, that it furnished the wits of the age with a prolific subject for satire.[2] But apart from all this, it must be said to his honour that he was outspoken and honest in his dealings, inaccessible to corruption, and an enemy to *nepotism*, a generous, steadfast friend, and a munificent patron of the arts and sciences. Carried away by his admiration for ancient Roman architecture, especially that grand style still visible in the baths of Dioclesian, he commenced the work of rebuilding, upon a scale of unprecedented dimensions and splendour, the Basilica of St. Peter, which he had employed the celebrated *Bramante* to design. The Pope laid the corner-stone, April 18, 1506, in presence of the cardinals and surrounded by a vast concourse of people; and to raise money for its construction, granted an indulgence to such as contributed to the work. One of the first acts of Julius after entering upon the duties of his office was to check the dangerous pretensions of Cæsar Borgia, whom he deprived of the Duchy of Romagna, and sent into exile. The Duchy, together with the cities of Perugia and Bologna, was again annexed to the States of the Church. The despotic Baglionis were driven out from the former of these cities and from the latter the no less despotic Bentivoglios, after which their ancient liberties were restored by the Pope. Cæsar Borgia, banished from Rome and all Italy, ventured to go by sea from Ostia to Naples. Here he was, by order of his Catholic Majesty, arrested and conveyed to the Castle of Medina del Campo, in Spain, where he lay imprisoned for two years. At length he contrived to make good his escape, took service in the army of his brother-in-law, Jean d'Albret, King of Navarre, and finally lost his life, under the walls of the castle of Biano, March 12, 1507.[3]

The Venetians had given grave offence to the Pope by taking possession of and holding the cities of Faenza and Rimini, and a tract of sea-board within his dominions. To humble them and effect a

[1] *Panvinio*, Historia delle Vite dei Sommi Pontefici.—Giulio II., Pont. CCXX., p. 257, Venice, 1594. (Tr.)

[2] *Julius exclusus*, by Hutten, or Erasmus (Pasquill., T. II., Eleutheropoli, i. e., Basil., 1544, p. 423 sq.)

[3] *Audin*, Biograph. Univ., T. 5. (Tr.)

partition of their territory, Julius formed a coalition, in 1508, known as the *League of Cambrai*,[1] to which, besides himself, Maximilian of Germany, Louis XII. of France, and Ferdinand of Spain were parties. Spiritual as well as material weapons were employed by Julius to bring the Republic to terms. The Venetians, seeing that it was useless to contend against so formidable a coalition, complied with the demands of the Pope, and were absolved from ecclesiastical censures.

Julius next turned the power of his arms against his vassal, Alphonsus of Este, Duke of Ferrara, who had contested with the Holy See the right of suzerainty over the States of Italy, and entered into an alliance with Louis XII., of whose political influence on the peninsula Julius was becoming apprehensive. The Duke of Ferrara was banished the country. This conduct greatly irritated Louis, who, at the instance of certain cardinals, resolved, while Julius was at the head of his army in Italy, to employ *spiritual weapons* against the latter.

The prelates, and the deputies and chapters of universities within the kingdom of France, met at Orleans, August, A. D. 1510, whence they went to Tours, and while there, gave it as their opinion to Louis, that the Pope had no sort of right to make war on foreign princes, and that, should he do so, these were at liberty to withhold their obedience from him, and to utterly disregard his censures. They also represented that the present Pope was particularly at fault since, instead of giving his attention to the business of an œcumenical council, which he had pledged himself by oath in conclave to convoke before the expiration of two years, he was engaged in carrying on war.

Maximilian entered warmly into Louis' project of holding a council *independently of the Pope*, and published a manifesto, in which he declared that, should the latter refuse to convoke it, he would appeal to the cardinals. Some of the latter were found pliant enough to give their support to the schismatical design of these princes, and appointed *Pisa* as the place of meeting for the proposed council (November 5, A. D. 1511).

Soderini, gonfaloniere of Florence, imprudently extended the hospitality of the city to the rebellious cardinals.

The members of this robber-council protested in advance against any censures the Pope might pass upon them.[2] The conventicle, which was composed chiefly of Frenchmen, and was but a very indifferent copy of the Council of Basle, went to the length of suspending the Pope, who was styled "*another Goliath*."

Julius II. defended himself against the charges of which he had been accused, by representing that the troubled condition of Europe, and particularly of Italy, rendered it impossible for him to convoke the council as he had promised, much as he might desire to do so.

In the year 1512, he entered into a fresh coalition with Ferdinand

[1] *Dubos*, Hist. de la ligue faite à Cambrai, La Haye, 1710, 2 T.

[2] Acta concilii Pisani, Par., 1612, 4to, as conciliabulum Pisanum, in *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1559 sq. Conf. *Richerii*, Hist. concilior., lib. IV., c. 2, 3.

the Catholic of Spain and Naples, and Henry VIII. of England, and with Switzerland, which forced the French to retire from Italy. Deprived of the protection of French arms, and regarded with suspicion by the Florentines, of whose territory Pisa then formed a part, the prelates withdrew to Milan, then a mere French fortress, thence to Asti, and finally to Lyons. Julius now laid all France, with the exception of Bretagne, under interdict.

The *Eighteenth Œcumenical or fifth Council of Lateran*, which the Pope had in the meantime convoked, convened May 10, A. D. 1512. At the opening session there were present fifteen cardinals and seventy-nine bishops, but this number was soon increased to one hundred and twenty, the majority of whom were Italians.[1]

Giles of Viterbo, the General of the Augustinians, delivered the opening address, in which he drew a vivid picture of the evils that distracted and afflicted the Church.[2] "Julius II.," said he, "*is indeed the first pontiff who has successfully employed the arms of secular warfare in defence of the Church. But for all this, it is not in such weapons the Church puts her trust. She can never count certainly on success, until her bishops, assembled in council, make use of those weapons of which the Apostle speaks, and with which she is to go forth and achieve that victory to which the Catholic world is now hopefully looking forward. If the Church is great, she has become so through victories gained in spiritual warfare. An extension of territory is of no great importance to her; her spiritual wealth is her all.*"

This Council, which was recognized by the Emperor Maximilian, through his representative, *Matthew Lang*, Bishop of Gurk, who arrived during the third session, employed its first five sessions in reviewing and condemning the decrees of the conventicle of Pisa. The Fathers were proceeding to consider the case of France, where there had been a movement on foot to set up an antipope in the person of the Abbot of Clugny, and a disposition to frighten the Holy See by holding the Pragmatic Sanction over him *in terrorem*, when Julius II. died, February 22, A. D. 1513, still meditating great reforms.

"History," says *Audin*, "presents no example of a man destined to wear a crown who possessed in a higher degree all the qualities of a great ruler. Equally unsearchable to all who approached him, he was still a stranger to dissimulation; bold in his designs, but never rash in his execution; quick to resolve, but correct in his calculations. He was patient in adversity, fearless in danger, merciful in the hour of victory."[3]

[1] Acta Conc. Lateran. V. œcumen., in *Harduin*, T. IX., pp. 1561-1856.

[2] Conf. *Harduin*, L. c., p. 1576 sq., where it is said, among other things: "Ad hæc vero agenda cum alia permulta, tum præcipue exercitus amissus excitare nos debet: quod equidem putem divina providentia factum, quo armis ecclesiæ alienis freti cederemus, ut ad nostra redeuntes victores evaderemus. Nostra autem arma sunt pietas, religio, probitas, supplicationes, vota, lorica fidei atque arma lucis, ut Apostoli verbis utar. Ad quæ si Synodi opera redibimus, ut armis non nostris inferiores aliquo hoste fuimus, ita nostris erimus omni hoste superiores."

[3] *Audin*, Histoire de Léon X., T. I., p. 257, 12mo. (Tr.

"That an old Pope," says *Rohrbacher*, "rarely free from sickness, should undertake to beat simultaneously both the King of France and the Emperor of Germany, for the purpose of teaching them that he was master in his own house, is indeed a little surprising; but not more so than to see Frenchmen and Germans, in works of biography and history, represent this act of self-defence as a scandalous abuse of power, probably because he defeated them instead of being defeated by them."[1] "He cannot," says *Panvinio*, "be too much praised for having so courageously and perseveringly exerted himself to preserve and extend the States of the Church; although there be some who, believing him to have been more given to the profession of arms than was compatible with his state, are inclined to give him scant credit."[2] "The character of Julius," says *Kraus*, "though vehement and sometimes carrying him beyond the limits of moderation, was one of incomparable grandeur. He well deserved the most magnificent sepulchral monument of the prince of artists."[3]

When we reflect on the political and warlike character of this Pope, it need scarcely excite surprise in us to be told that the Emperor Maximilian, who had now become a widower, entertained designs of securing the papacy for himself,[4] with the intention probably of combining the papal and the imperial dignity in one person. In this he was unsuccessful. The fifty cardinals, who went into conclave, elected the young Cardinal-deacon, Giovanni dei Medici, now in the thirty-eighth year of his age, who, on ascending the papal throne, March 19, A. D. 1513, took the name of *Leo X.* He had been ordained priest on the 15th of the same month, and consecrated bishop on the 17th. Leo was a true representative of his age. An ardent admirer of classic and humane culture, he possessed a refined taste, had a love of elegant literature, and was sincerely devoted to the arts and sciences. But, for all this, he was entirely destitute of the motives and spirit which should form the guiding principles in the life of an ecclesiastic, and was, moreover, lavishly extravagant.

The first exercise of his authority was to found a college for the publication of the Greek authors, under the superintendence of the celebrated *Lascaris*. The Vatican became the resort of savans, literati, and artists.[5] *Bembo* and *Sadolet*, distinguished for the purity and elegance of their Latinity, were at once created cardinals and appointed his secretaries; *Bramante* and the great universal genius, *Michael Angelo*, were at work upon St. Peter's, and *Raphael*, surnamed

[1] *Rohrbacher*, Hist. Univ. de l'Église, Vol. 22, p. 375 sq. (Tr.)

[2] *Panvinio*, Historia delle Vite dei Sommi Pontefici, Giulio II., p. 260. (Tr.)

[3] Michael Angelo's statue of Moses in the Church of San Pietro in Vincoli, *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 436. (Tr.)

[4] The correctness of the rumour is proven by *Aschbach* (*Dieringer's* Cath. Jour., 1845) It was probably the conduct of some of the popes that inspired *Guignecourt* to say that the Church would get on quite as well without them. See the letter of the University of Paris to the antipope Clement VII., 1394. *Albert Jäger*, Relation of Emperor Maximilian to the Papacy, Vienna, 1854.

[5] Cf. *Audin*, Life of Pope Leo X. (transl. from the Fr. into Germ. by Burg, Augsburg, 1845, 2 vols.; into English by Turnbull, and also by Bishop McGill.

"*The Divine*," was engaged in decorating the loggie and the stanze. The work of the Lateran Council, which Louis of France now acknowledged, was again taken up where it had been left off in the *fifth* session, on the death of Julius II.

The old question of reform was again discussed, and decrees proposed which provided for a purer morality and a stricter discipline; proscribed the excessive study of the Pagan classics and the absurd doctrine that the world possessed a soul; denied that there existed an antagonism between philosophical and theological truths, and abolished the practice of the same person holding several ecclesiastical benefices, the possession of which would require incompatible duties; condemned the concubinage of the clergy and the employment of interdicts for trivial causes, and recommended the erection of *Montes Pietatis*, or establishments where the poor might obtain small loans at a trifling percentage, this being limited, by act of government, to what was barely necessary to defray expenses.

These salutary measures were received with indifference. The evil had grown to such vast dimensions that the men of that age lacked the nerve, the vigour, and the determination to look it steadily in the face, to grapple with it, and to persevere in the struggle till it should have been crushed, or at least rendered harmless. And, of all the men of his time, *Leo* was perhaps least fitted, either by nature or education, to undertake and conduct to a successful issue so difficult a task.[1] He was far more intent on having the Pragmatic Sanction abolished, and in this he succeeded in a private interview he had with Francis I. at Bologna, in 1515. A *concordat* regulating the affairs of the French Church was drawn up by the two parties and confirmed by the Council of Lateran,[2] but rejected by the French Parliament, which charged the king with abusing his authority because he firmly insisted on its acceptance.[3] With this, Leo fancied that the object of the Council had been completely attained, and seemed either totally oblivious of, or entirely disregarded, the decay that had come upon every branch of ecclesiastical discipline, and which, while it was eating into and poisoning the very life of the Church, was no uncertain token of the sad days that were soon to follow. Leo, after having made provision that the tithes of all benefices should, during the succeeding three years, be paid into the papal treasury for the purpose of defraying the expenses of a war against the Turks,

[1] *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1513, nro. 97, relates the following incident: "When Leo X. was informed that almost the half of the prelates were demanding a reform of the whole body ecclesiastic in its head members, papa *quasi subridens* dixit, velle aliquantulum cogitare, ut omnibus satisfiat, et sic in prima sessione futura deliberare, quod omnium reformatio fiat, tam sui quam *reformatorum !*"

[2] Textus integer Concordator. inter Leon. X. et Franc. I. (*Harduin*, T. IX., pp. 1867-1890).

[3] Relation de ce qui se passa sur la publication et l'enseignement du Concordat au Parlement de Paris. *Münch's* Collection of all Concordats, Pt. I., p. 225, and *Richerii.*, Histor. Conc.. lib. IV., Pt. II., c. 4, nro. 13.

dismissed the prelates at the close of the twelfth session, March 16, A. D. 1517.[1]

Thomas de Vio da Gaëta (Cajetanus), the General of the Dominican Order, had besought the Pope, as he valued the welfare of the Church, not to close the Council; but his foresight was not appreciated, nor were his words of warning heeded. The deplorable state of the Church at this time caused *Gailer of Kaisersberg* to utter these prophetic words: "*Since neither the Pope, the Emperor, the King, nor the Bishops will undertake the work of reform, God will presently send one who will.*

§ 275. *Review of the Situation of the Papacy.*

The one great object that occupied the minds and engaged the energies of all during this controversy was to define, both in theory and practical working, the exact limits of papal authority, to restore it to its primitive and *normal* condition. Two very different and diametrically opposite ways were pursued to reach this end—the one led straight to a *centralization* of all power *in* the hands of *the episcopacy;* the other, scarcely less direct, to an attempt to erect *the papacy* into an absolute monarchy. The advocates of the former theory were the Fathers of the Councils of Constance and Basle, and pre-eminently the celebrated theologians, *Henry of Langenstein* (de Hassia), *Gerson*, *Peter d'Ailly*, *Nicholas de Cusa*, *Nicholas de Clemange*, and others. These maintained that the temporal power was wholly independent of the spiritual authority; that *œcumenical councils* were possessed of supreme legislative authority, including within its range even the Pope himself, who, they said, is indeed the *administrative* (*caput ministeriale ecclesiæ*), but not the *constituent* Head of the Church; and that, since his authority is dependent upon that of the episcopacy, it is lawful to appeal from his decision to the judgment of a council. "All bishops," said Nicholas de Cusa, "have their power immediately from God; and, hence, questions of rank and priority relate entirely to the exercise of this power, and must be settled by established rules, which are, on this very account, subsidiary to, and not of the essence of, the power itself. Christ, in addressing Peter, spoke to all the other apostles as well, and committed to him no special grant of power.[2] The Pope is, therefore, only *the first among equals* (*primus inter pares*)."

These erroneous opinions were the underlying principles of a complete system, whose aim and scope centred in the one purpose of degrading the authority of the Holy See, and of unduly restricting the rights and prerogatives which had been freely accorded to it

[1] *Roscoe*, Life and Pontificate of Leo X., Liverpool, 1804, 4 vols., 4to; London, 1806, 6 vols.; transl. into Italian: Vita e Pontificato di Leone X., etc. (free compilation), Milano, 1816, 12 vols.; Germ. by *Glaser*, with annotations by *Henke*, Lps., 1806, sq., 3 vols.; Vienna, 1818. *Fabroni*, Vita Leon X., Pisis, 1797, 4to. *Ranke*, The Popes of Rome, their Church and State during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Berlin, 1834, sq., Vol. I., p. 71 sq., pp. 80-90 of ed. 2.

[2] *Nic. Cusan.*, De concord. cath., lib. II., c. 4-13.

during the lapse of a long course of ages. To make matters worse, secular princes strengthened the hands of these unworthy ecclesiastics, and busied themselves in throwing fresh difficulties in the way of a settlement.

To defend this *theory of episcopal authority* a pretence was made of an appeal to history, but only incidentally and with partisan dishonesty. Thus, Nicholas de Cusa[1] proved the Decretals of Isidore Mercator to be spurious, and *Laurentius Valla* showed that the so-called Donation of Constantine was a forgery, as if either, or both, whether genuine or otherwise, would in the least affect papal authority.

On the other hand, the popes showed no disposition either to contract the limits of their spiritual authority, or to relinquish any part of that supreme power which they had acquired. Their defenders, among whom were *Turrecremata*, *Thomas of Sarzano*, and others equally distinguished, also appealed to history, where they had certainly the advantage of their adversaries, and contended that the spiritual authority was necessarily above the secular; that the Pope was the source of all episcopal jurisdiction, and superior to an œcumenical council.

Towards the close of this period, the Dominican, *Thomas de Vio of Gaëta* (Cajetanus), and *James Almain*, a doctor of the Sorbonne, were the two most prominent advocates of these two schools of opinion.[2] It is unfortunate that the disputants, in the heat of controversy, should have lost sight of the only practicable way of adjusting the difficulty. Had they taken the pains to read history aright, they would have learned, first, that without the centralized power of the papacy the Church could never have come safe through the disorders and anarchy of the Middle Ages; and, next, that the schism could not have been closed except by the application of the principles advanced by the advocates of episcopal rights. The line of procedure had been clearly traced out by *Nicholas V.* in an address made by him to the ambassadors of the electoral princes, sent to Rome to congratulate him on his election to the papacy. "It is indeed true," said he, "that the popes have so far extended their authority beyond just limits, that they have finally absorbed that of the bishops; and the natural result of such a policy has been, that the Fathers of Basle have gone to the other extreme, and attempted to unduly restrict the authority of the Pope. When one sets out with conduct unworthy of himself and unbecoming his office, he must expect to be eventually the victim of injustice; just as a tree that is inclined too much to one side is in the righting often dragged too much to the other. For my own part, I have firmly purposed not to invade the legitimate

[1] Ibid., lib. II., c. 34; lib. III., c. 2 and 3. Concerning *Laurentius Valla*, see Vol. I., p. 42, note 2, and Fascicul. rer. expetendarum, etc., fol. 64-80, ed. Colon., 1535.

[2] *Cajetani*, Tractat de comparatione auctoritatis Papæ et Conc. (*Rocaberti*, Bibl. max. Pontificia, T. XIX.) *Jac. Almaini*, Tract. de auctor. eccl. et Concilior. gener. (*Gersonii*. Opp., ed. *du Pin*, T. II., p. 976).

rights of bishops, and a share in the government of the Church is certainly a prerogative of their office. *There is but one way to preserve inviolate the authority of the Pope, and that is to respect, to the full, the authority of every other member of the hierarchy.*[1]

These *councils*, assembled for the purpose of providing measures of reform, lost sight of their avowed object in endless debates on papal supremacy. They seemed determined to bring this question to an issue, and to decide it one way or the other. Its discussion consumed the time that should have been given to reform, and this, by being indefinitely deferred, was more completely ignored than if it had never been taken up. Neither could much encouragement be expected from *Popes* who could not be unconscious that every adequate measure of reform would bear heavily on themselves. Moreover, the protracted sojourn of the Popes at Avignon, the Western Schism, the scandalous events consequent upon it, and the reprehensible conduct of many of the Popes, had given so violent a shock to the authority of the Holy See, that its decrees were no longer received with respect and obedience by the Catholic world.

Again, the unity of the Church was threatened by the action of the various governments which attempted, by concordats and pragmatic sanctions, such as those of Bourges, Frankfort, and Mentz, to establish national churches.

Notwithstanding all the evils that came upon religion in this age, and in spite of every effort that had been made to obscure, and, if possible, to obliterate the very idea of the papacy, this, nevertheless, retained its hold all the same on the great bulk of the people, and was regarded as the underlying principle of Catholic unity, and the essential condition to the government of the Church. "The voice of the Pope," says *Schröckh*, "was obeyed with as much alacrity at the opening of the sixteenth century as it was under Boniface VIII. at the close of the thirteenth." So singular a phenomenon can be adequately accounted for on no other theory than by attributing it to that abiding assistance which God has promised to his Church, and which, in spite of all the abuses human frailty and wickedness may bring upon her, preserves inviolate her divine and *essential* element and keeps it aglow in the hearts of the faithful.

It was, indeed, a beautiful and truly Christian idea, to so adjust the relations of the Papacy and the Empire, that they should work harmoniously together, and pursue, each in its own way, a common line of action; and this spirit of agreement, though gradually growless cordial, was yet, on some solemn occasions, sufficiently prominent. As Henry II. had on one occasion read the Gospel at the Papal Mass at Fulda, so also did Sigismund, in the present age, serve as deacon at a Mass celebrated by John XXIII. at Constance; and Charles IV., when entering Rome, led the horse of Urban V. by the bridle, and, later on, requested Gregory XI. to give the papal sanction to the

[1] In *Koch*, Sanctio pragm. Germ. illustr., cap. 2, § 15.

appointment of his son, Wenceslaus, as King of Rome. But at the close of this period Maximilian inaugurated a new era by assuming, at Trent, in the year 1508, the title of Emperor elect *of Rome*, without having received the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope.

§ 276. *Review of the Condition of the other Members of the Hierarchy.*

The labours of these councils, convened, as has been said, for the avowed purpose of providing measures of reform, were chiefly taken up in attempts to render the *bishops* more independent of the Holy See, and to secure for them that measure of authority which they had enjoyed in the primitive Church. But the bulk of the bishops, conscious that any abridgment of papal authority would result in a degradation of their own, and subject their estates to the authority of temporal princes, refused the extraordinary prerogatives with which the councils were ready to invest them.

The inferior clergy had also ample reason to complain, in France, of the serious grievances which they were forced to suffer in consequence of the encroachments of the secular magistrates on their rights and privileges, and of the independent ecclesiastical jurisdiction exercised over them by the bishops of Germany. The condition of both laity and clergy was rendered still more intolerable by the *burdensome direct and indirect taxes* levied by the Court of Rome, and by its practice of *conferring benefices chiefly upon foreigners*, relatives, cardinals, and favourites, who, far from being the best qualified, seemed altogether unfit to take charge of souls.

The clergy of Germany complained most bitterly of these practices. "The Court of Rome," says *Meyer*, the chancellor of the elector of Mentz, "has devised a thousand contrivances for extorting money from us, as if we were barbarians."

The plea for the See of Rome, written by *Æneas Sylvius*,[1] was coldly received, and called forth from James Wimpheling, a priest of Spire (A. D. 1510), a brief and cutting reply. Still, things went on in the old way; the bishops continued to take the usual oath of fidelity to the Pope, and while consenting to pay, besides the pallium tax, an additional one for the privilege of retaining their bishoprics, indemnified themselves by extorting money for the collation of benefices, alleging in excuse of the practice, that as they themselves had not received, so neither could they confer offices and dignities gratuitously.

The bishops also contrived to obtain control of a great number of benefices, and the cardinals did the same whenever they were fortunate enough to secure the favour of some Pope. The *chapters* refused to admit among their number any but nobles, notwithstanding the severe regulations that Gregory IX. had made for the correction of

[1] Descriptio de ritu, situ, moribus et conditione Germaniæ, in Æneæ Sylv. Opp., and in *Bzovii*, Annal. eccles., T. XVII., p. 186 sq.

this abuse.[1] This, with many other similar abuses, was sharply censured by the Council of Constance, for the reason that, if the practice were allowed to go on, the chapters would eventually contain only men destitute alike of zeal and learning, and who, on becoming bishops, would work the ruin of the Church. The Council, therefore, directed that for the future one-fourth of canons composing each chapter should be selected from among the lower walks of life, and that these should be doctors either of theology or of laws, or, at least, have gone through a thorough course of studies and taken their academic degrees.[2]

The bishops, wholly disregarding the authority of the Holy See, of which they had once stood in so much awe, but which had now fallen so low that they might set it at defiance with impunity, shamefully neglected the care of their flocks; but beyond this, there was no change in the mode of administering dioceses. Numbers of the bishops were absent from their sees during the residence of the popes at Avignon, and alleged the example of the latter in extenuation of their own conduct. One of these, whom Gregory XI. reproved for absence and neglect of duty, promptly replied: "But do you show me the example by returning to Rome."

Still the Councils passed rigorous decrees enjoining the duty of residence.[3]

§ 277. *Morals of the Clergy.*

The gradual decline of papal influence and the evil example of the lives of some of the popes reacted with terrible effect upon the morals of the bishops. As many of these had secured their sees by the employment of questionable means, it need excite no surprise if, having once entered upon the duties of their office, they led lives the reverse of exemplary, and did absolutely nothing to elevate the standard of morality among the faithful. The following description, drawn by *Vincent Ferrer*, of the bishops of his day, will certainly not fall in with our idea of a modern prelate: "They are vain and arrogant courtiers, lovers of fine living and pompous display, and much given to usury; they make their faith subservient to schemes of worldly wealth and ambition, and entirely neglect the care of their churches; they visit the great ones of the world and the wealthy, but seldom the

[1] See § 230, Vol. II., p. 463, note 5. Cf. *Höfler*, Rupert of the Palatinate, Freiburg, 1861, p. 113. The contradictory conduct of influential ecclesiastics in this matter was curiously illustrated at Basle, where none but nobles were admitted into the chapters, while at Augsburg all but commoners were excluded.

[2] Apud *v. d. Hardt*, T. I., Pt. X., Reformatorium in Conc. Constant., c. 34: In qualibet ecclesia cathedrali sit *una præbenda pro magistro in Theologia*, qui saltem bis in septimana legat et aliquando prædicet, et *una pro doctore juris Canonici vel civilis* qui in causis ecclesiæ patrocinari teneatur.—De aliis vero præbendis *quarta pars graduatis debeatur in Theologia jure canonico vel civili*, cap. 35. To put a stop to the abuse of selecting only nobles for canonries, it is said: "*Gradus* etiam *doctoratus* vel *licentiatus in sacra pagina, jure canonico vel civili pro quacunque nobilitate reputentur*," p. 638 sq. The same dispositions are repeated, but more energetically, p. 695, lib. III., titul. III., De præbendis et dignitatibus.

[3] Reform. Const. Conc. decret., lib. III., titul II: De clericis non residentibus in eccl. vel præbenda (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., Pt. XII., p. 694).

poor and the lowly; they have neither simplicity, love of God, nor chastity, and the celebration of Holy Mass and the preaching of the Word of God have ceased to be objects of their solicitude; in short, their entire life is one uninterrupted scandal." This is certainly a frightful picture, and one which, if at all applicable to the bulk of the episcopacy, would undoubtedly argue a terrible dissoluteness of morals; this, however, is by no means the case, as is evident from the great number of those bishops whose constant cry at œcumenical councils, was for a "*reformation of the Church in her Head and members.*"

But, on the other hand, it must be admitted that morality, especially among the lower clergy and in the monasteries, was dissolute indeed in the fifteenth century. Were other evidence of this assertion wanting, the fact that extraordinary papal visitors, such as *Nicholas de Cusa*, *John Busch*, and *Paulus*[1], were sent out to investigate into the state of affairs, and that the councils of the time found it necessary to provide special legislation to meet the evil, would be sufficient to substantiate it. Concubinage was the crying vice among the clergy of many dioceses.

It is true that such pictures, as that given above, are often greatly exaggerated, and, as a rule, are stricken off in a moment of indignant horror, when the information of some scandal is borne in with crushing effect upon the soul of one who is sensitive of the honour of the Church and the good name of the clergy. Such scandals will occur in the very best and purest ages, and cannot be assumed as fairly representing even the worst and most dissolute. Neither can the action of synods be taken as conclusive against the morals of any age; for never yet did a synod convene, which did not complain, in a temper more or less disheartening, of the degeneracy of morals, and manifest an anxious solicitude for their improvement.

But after allowance has been made for every such modifying circumstance, the fact that during this age the morality of the clergy was deplorable, is still before us in all its hideous deformity.

This dissoluteness of morals rapidly infected the laity, who learned from those whose lives should have been examples of manly honesty and priestly honour, to put a light estimate on the virtue of purity.[2] The leading minds of the councils were divided as to what means to employ for removing so deep a stain from the priestly character. Some professed to believe that the marriage of the clergy was the only adequate remedy for the evil; but others, more far-seeing and of

[1] Cf. the Reformatorium in concil. Constant., cap. 33, contra concubinarios. (*v. a. Hardt*, T. I., P. X., p. 635.) *Concil. Basil.*, sess. XX., decret. I.: De concubinariis (*Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1193; *Mansi*, T. XXIX., p. 101.) *Düx*, Nichol. de Cusa, Pt. II., pp. 12-75.

[2] The Council of Paris, 1429, complained of the bad example set by clerics (*Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1406; *Mansi*, T. XXVIII., p. 1107), and adds: "Illud nefandissimum scelus (concubinatus) in ecclesia Dei adeo invaluit, ut jam non credant Christiani, simplicem fornicationem esse peccatum mortale"

wider range of thought, such as *Gerson*,[1] protested against the suggestion, and maintained that the well-being of the Church depended upon the rule of celibacy, the observance of which would be rendered morally certain if based upon a thoroughly clerical education, an education such as is consonant with a divine calling to the priesthood. Decrees were enacted punishing with fines and deposition those of the clergy who should refuse to leave off living in concubinage.[2]

As these disorders were very generally believed to be a consequence of the great wealth of the clergy, many asserted that the removal of so potent an occasion of sin was the first step towards either forming a new clergy, with more exalted principles of priestly purity and honour, or raising up those of the existing clergy from the depth of degradation to which their avarice and their immorality had precipitated them, and establishing them once more in the esteem and affections of a laity who now regarded them with aversion and contempt.

§ 278. *Negotiations with the Greek Church for a restoration of Union—Seventeenth Œcumenical Council at Ferrara and Florence.*

Hefele, The Temporary Reunion of the Greek with the Latin Church, two articles (in the Tübg. Quart. of Theol., 1847). *Pichler*, Hist. of the Schism between the Church of the East and the West, Vol. I., p. 383. *Zhishmann*, Treaties of union between the Oriental and Roman Churches, from the beginning of the fifteenth century to the Council of Ferrara (exclusively), Vienna, 1858. *Frommann*, Critical Supplements towards a History of the Church Union of Florence, Halle, 1872.

After the restoration of the Greek and Latin Churches to unity, effected after so many sacrifices and with the very best motives, at the Fourteenth Œcumenical Council, held at Lyons (1274), had been rejected by the fanatical Greeks, owing chiefly to the imbecility of the reigning dynasty, many other similar but less imposing attempts were made to bring about the same object, but with little, if any success. When the Turks, who had already gained possession of Adrianople, were seriously menacing Constantinople, another effort at reconciliation was made by *John VIII.*, *Palæologus*, who came to Rome to confer personally with the Pope, while *Nicholas de Cusa* was pushing forward the same good work at Constantinople. The *schismatical Council of Basle*, after its fashion, interfered to complicate matters between the Pope and the emperor, and even sent a fleet to convey the latter and the bishops accompanying him to the shores of Italy. But in the meantime the Greek emperor, *Joseph*, *Patriarch* of Constantinople, and seven hundred Greeks embarked on board the fleet placed at their disposal by Eugene IV., and after a voyage of seventy-seven days, arrived at the harbour of Venice, whence they proceeded to

[1] *Gerson* wrote against Saignet his Dialogus sophiæ et naturæ super cœlibatu ecclesiasticor. (Opp., T. II., p. 617 sq.) Cf. *Schwab*, John Gerson, pp. 696-704.

[2] Such decrees were issued by the Council of Presburg (Posonia), A. D. 1309, can. 5; the Council of Basle, Sess. XX., see above, p. 929. n. 1: a synod of Breslau, held between 1447 and 1456 (*Harzheim*, Conc. Germ., T. V., p. 445, De cohabitatione clericorum et mulierum.) The Council of Paris, 1429, can. 23, forbade the infliction of such fines (*Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1045: *Mansi*, T. XXVIII., p. 1108).

Ferrara. One hundred and sixty Western bishops, some of whom were from Basle, but mostly from other quarters, had already assembled in this city at the call of Eugene, and on January 8, 1438, continued the sessions of the dissolved Council of Basle. The Pope made his appearance at Ferrara during the second session, February 15th, and published a decree summoning the Fathers of Basle to dissolve their assembly within forty days. This they refused to do. The work of "*reform*" that had been intrusted to the Fathers of Basle was now set aside, and the *union of the Greek and Latin Churches* taken up by the Fathers of Ferrara and Florence. That the Council, opened at the former and continued at the latter city, was entirely independent of that of Basle, possessed all the qualifications of preceding general councils, and is correctly numbered among those designated *œcumenical*, there can be no doubt.

Things went on in the usual way until the arrival of the Greeks, in March, who again complicated matters by raising questions of precedence, prerogative, and others equally senseless and annoying, regarding the proper ceremonial to be observed in receiving the emperor and patriarch. So extravagant were the pretensions of the former that it was with difficulty he could be persuaded not to enter on horseback the church in which the Council was in session.

These trifles having been settled, the *united* Council of the Greek and Latin Churches, numbering one hundred and forty members, exclusive of abbots and other superiors of religious houses, was formally and solemnly declared *opened*, April 8, 1438, in the gloomy cathedral of Ferrara. A decree was passed ordering all whose duty or privilege it was to attend the Council to appear at Ferrara within four months. Owing to this delay, six months passed before the first general session of the Council was held (October 8th), after which the sessions were continued uninterruptedly until the sixteenth. According to a prearranged programme, the proceedings were to embrace all the palmary points of difference between the two Churches, viz., 1. The addition of the "*Filioque*" to the Symbol; 2. The procession of the Holy Ghost; 3. Purgatory and the condition of the blessed after death; 4. The Epiclesis of the Liturgy, or the invocation of the Holy Ghost as the consecrator; and the use of leavened and unleavened bread at the altar; 5. The Primacy; 6. Divorce, &c The prolonged and wearisome discussions of the Greeks and Latins at *Ferrara* included all these *controverted* points, but were chiefly devoted to the inquiry as to whether the addition of the "*Filioque*" to the Symbol was lawful and capable of defence. The extraordinary charge made by *Marcus Eugenicus*, Archbishop of Ephesus, and *Anthony*, Archbishop of Heraclea, and supported in a restricted and milder form by *Bessarion*, Archbishop of Nice, the most eminent scholar among the Greeks, was unanswerably refuted by *Andrew*, Bishop of Rhodus (called *Colossensis*), but, if possible, still more ably by Cardinal *Julian Cesarini*, who pointed out that the "*Filoque*" was, accurately speaking, neither a change nor an addition, but

simply an *explanatory* clause, intended to bring out the meaning of the Symbol *more fully* and *explicitly*, and that in making such verbal additions for the sake of clearness, the Latin Church might appeal to the precedent of the Council of Constantinople (381), which had introduced several explanatory clauses into the Symbol of Nice. *Louis*, Archbishop of *Forli*, further remarked that there existed no law of the Church forbidding explanatory words to be added to the Symbols.

During the sixteenth and last session held at Ferrara, the presence of a plague which seriously threatened the city, and the scarcity of food which was now commencing to be pressingly felt, led the Pope to transfer the Council to *Florence*, for which reason it takes its name from this city. Here the first session was held, February 26, 1439. It was determined to proceed at once to the discussion of the doctrinal authorisation of the "*Filioque*;" and the Latins set to work in earnest to confute the statement of the Greeks, that the addition implied the Manichæan error of a *twofold* principle of the Holy Ghost. Though frequently refuted and disclaimed, the charge was again and again urged by *Marcus*, Archbishop of Ephesus, whose chief opponent among the Latins was *Johannes a Ragusio*, the Dominican provincial of Lombardy. Each reproached the other with being needlessly prolix. The Dominican provincial, besides being ably assisted by *Ambrose Traversari*, a Camaldolite abbot, who supported his argument by many and copious extracts from the writings of the Greek Fathers, also skilfully availed himself of the very old manuscript copies of the works of St. John Damascene and of St. Basil against Eunomius, brought from Constantinople by Nicholas de Cusa, from the latter of which it was clearly shown that its illustrious author taught that the Holy Ghost proceeded, not from the Father only, *but from the Son also*. The debate was long, wearisome, and acrimonious. By order of the emperor, Marcus Eugenicus, Archbishop of Ephesus, and Anthony, Archbishop of Heraclea, the two most bitter opponents to the union, abstained from the discussion, which was now chiefly confined to Archbishop *Bessarion*, whose enlightened views and conciliatory disposition paved the way to a reconciliation. *Joseph*, Patriarch *of Constantinople*, with his dying words, exhorted his countrymen to consummate the union.[1] At length the majority of the Greeks agreed to a joint profession of faith with the Latins on this most difficult of controverted points, which ran as follows: "*Since the Latin Fathers teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and Son as from one sole principle, and*

[1] He was found dead at the table, and beside him, written in straggling hand, were the following words: "*Joseph, by the mercy of God, Archbishop of Constantinople, the New Rome, and Œcumenical Patriarch:* Being now at the end of my days, and about to pay the common debt of mankind, I wish, by the grace of God, to communicate, in open writ and over my own signature, my dying sentiments to all my spiritual children—'Whatever the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of ancient Rome believes and teaches, this do I believe and obey; and I do most solemnly confess that the Pope of ancient Rome is the Father of fathers, the sovereign Pontiff and Vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ; and I also confess the doctrine of purgatory. In witness whereof, I hereunto set my signature, this 9th day of June. 1439, of the second indiction.'"

by one sole production, called spiration; and since their meaning is the same as that of the Greek Fathers, who teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son, therefore all obstacle to union is removed."

To a deputation of Greeks who visited Pope Eugene on the following day, he said: "We are now agreed as to the main point; and to bring about an immediate union, it only remains to clear up some minor questions concerning purgatory, the primacy, unleavened bread, and the form of consecration in the Mass."

The Latins and Greeks had already discussed the question of *Purgatory* in several conferences at Ferrara. The teaching of the Latin Church was clearly and precisely set forth by Cardinal Julian, but still more exhaustively by *John Turrecremata;* and a very doubtful and contradictory exposition of the Greek teaching was given by Marcus Eugenicus, who stated in conclusion that "he had formerly been under the impression that the two Churches were more at variance on this doctrine." The exposition of Bessarion was much clearer and more intelligible. He said the Greeks believed Purgatory to be a place of *suffering* or *punishment*, but rejected the idea of *fire* in this connection. When *fire* was mentioned as an agent of punishment they understood that of *Hell*. With regard to the departed, he said, some of the Greeks believed that neither the punishment of the wicked nor the happiness of the just would be *complete* until after the resurrection of the body, which before that time could participate in neither felicity nor misery. The Latins, on the contrary, held that the punishment of the wicked and the happiness of the just would be *complete* immediately after death. This opinion was after a time embraced by Bessarion, but vehemently opposed by Marcus Eugenicus. After some further discussion the Greeks drew up the following declaration which proved satisfactory to the Latins: "Shortly after death (but before the resurrection of the bodies), the souls of the just enjoy the plenitude of bliss, and the souls of the wicked the plenitude of suffering; others are in a middle state, where they are cleansed (purgation); but whether they suffer by agency of fire, or darkness, or whirlwind, or any other specific mode of punishment, is an open question."[1]

The question of the *azyme*, after having been ably discussed by John Turrecremata, was disposed of by the declaration of the Greeks that either leavened or unleavened bread might be used at the altar.

The controversy on *consecration* presented greater difficulties. The Greeks admitted that the efficient form of consecration were the words of institution (This is My Body), but contended that if they addressed a prayer (ἐπίκλησις) to God after consecration, begging Him by his Holy Ghost to change the Bread into the precious Body and the Cup into the precious Blood of his Son, the words were not to be taken literally, but as signifying an invocation of the Holy Ghost to descend upon the recipient, and change in him the Bread into the

[1] Cf. *Loch*, The Dogma of Purgatory in the Greek Church, Ratisbon, 1842.

precious Body, &c., in the sense that the reception of the Sacrament might be to him unto the cleansing of his soul and the remission of his sins, and not unto judgment and condemnation.

The proposal on the part of the Latins to place the invocation before the form of consecration, or to select another, was rejected by the Greeks, who replied that it was to be found in the liturgies, not only of *St. Basil* and *St. Chrysostom*, but also in those of St. Mark, and of the Armenians, Nestorians, and Copts. They further argued that something very similar was to be found in the Latin liturgy, in the words: "*Jube hæc preferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, etc.*," which was also placed after the form of consecration. The Greeks did not think it worth while to seriously consider the strange objection of the Latins against their omission of the *Confiteor* before Mass.

The controversy on the *Primacy* of the Bishop of Rome was prolix, heated, occasionally intemperate, and at one time threatened to frustrate all the efforts thus far made towards union. The emperor was particularly averse to admitting the claims of the Latins, and was repeatedly on the point of breaking off negotiations and departing for Constantinople. While ready to recognize the Primacy in theory, he resolutely refused to admit the practical conclusions to which such a concession would lead. He objected to appeals being made from the decision of patriarchs to the tribunal of the Holy See, and denied that the Pope enjoyed the exclusive right of convoking general councils. This right had been claimed by his predecessors, and to relinquish it would be to forego the shadow of supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs which he fancied was one of his prerogatives. But the Eastern prelates and theologians, who were beginning to understand that the freedom and independence of the Pope were the best guarantees of their own, did not share to the full the emperor's opposition, and were more inclined than he to acknowledge papal supremacy. Among the foremost advocates of the Primacy on the side of the Latins were *John Turrecremata*, *John a Ragusio*, and the Camaldolite abbot, *Ambrose Traversari*, who, according to the testimony of the Greeks, was, of all the Latins, the most conversant with the writings of the Greek Fathers. The emperor insisted, before admitting the Primacy of Rome, that instead of the current and sometimes rhetorical utterances of particular Greek doctors, specific *decrees of councils* should be quoted in its support. On the 26th of June, 1439, the Greeks finally presented the following formula as their ultimatum: "*We acknowledge the Pope to be the Sovereign Pontiff and Ruler, the Representative and Vicar of Christ, the Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, to the end that he may govern and rule the Church of God, but this without detriment to the rights and prerogatives of the Eastern Patriarchs. Of these, the next in dignity to the Pope, is he of Constantinople, to whom those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem are subordinate in rank.*" They added the hope that the union might be consummated on the approaching 29th of June, the Feast of the Princes of the Apostles. This con-

summation, however, was put off by the Greeks themselves, who took exception to several points in the decree of union (*Definitio Fidei*, ὅρος), drawn up by Anthony Traversari. They found fault with the heading because to the name and title "*Eugenius episcopus, servus servorum Dei,*" those of the Eastern Patriarchs and that of the emperor were not added. The latter wished to have the passage concerning the Pope changed, and the word *omnibus* inserted in the clause "*salvis juribus et privilegiis quatuor Patriarcharum.*" The Pope consented to accept all the modifications, and in this amended form the *Definitio* was subscribed to by the Greeks, Sunday, July 5, 1439.

On the following day Pope Eugene sang pontifical High Mass, at which both Latins and Greeks assisted. During the solemnity, Cardinal *Julian* read the full profession of faith in Latin, and Archbishop *Bessarion* in Greek, to which the Latin and Greek prelates, the plenipotentiaries of the Russians, Iberians, Wallachians, and of the Emperor of Trebizond assented by acclamation.

Of the *Deed of Union* we give the following extracts:

"Decree of the Holy Œcumenical Synod of Florence, Eugene, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, in perpetual remembrance, with the assent of our beloved Son in Christ, John Palæologus, the Illustrious Emperor of the Romans, and of the delegates of our venerable Brethren, the Patriarchs and other representatives of the Greek Church.

"Let the heavens rejoice and the earth break forth in songs of gladness. The wall of separation has fallen; the East and the West are not now, as in days past, two Churches, but one. Christ has again united them, and they are now bound together by the strong bonds of love and peace. The dreary days of schism are past, and the glorious splendour of a long-desired union brings light and gladness to all mankind. Who that is able now to make a worthy thank-offering to Almighty God? Truly is this the work of God and to be celebrated with heavenly song."

The formularies settling controversies centuries old, between the Greeks and Latins, are here given, and the decree goes on:

"Furthermore, we define that the Holy Apostolical See and the Bishop of Rome enjoy a primacy throughout the whole world; that the Roman Pontiff is the successor to Blessed Peter, Prince of Apostles; that he is the true Vicar of Christ, the Head of the Universal Church, and of all Christians the Father and Teacher; that to him was given, in Blessed Peter, by our Lord Jesus Christ, the fulness of power to feed, to rule, and to govern the universal Church, as is also set forth in the acts of œcumenical councils and in the Sacred Canons."[1]

[1] Of the few (four or five) copies of the Deed of Union in Greek and Latin, *with the autograph signature of the Greek Emperor*, one is extant in the public archives of the Grand Duchy of Baden at Carlsruhe, which is supposed to date back to Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy. In 1853, John Peter *Secchi*, S.J., librarian of the Roman College and brother of the celebrated astronomer in Rome, made use of it in preparing an edition of the Council

In the list of subscriptions to this Deed of Union, the names of the Pope and the cardinals come first; next, that of the Greek emperor, after which follow the prelates of both parties; the whole number of subscribers being thirty-two Greeks and one hundred and fourteen Latins, of whom eighteen were cardinals, two patriarchs, eight archbishops, and forty-seven bishops. Pope Eugene was much pained by the refusal of Marcus Eugenicus to subscribe.

After the solemn promulgation of this decree, Eugene requested the Greeks to give their assent to some further measures of lesser importance, the most notable of which were the following: 1. To make adultery no longer the cause of the dissolution of marriage; 2. To punish Marcus Eugenicus, Archbishop of Ephesus, for his stubborn resistance to the union; 3. To elect, before leaving Florence, a patriarch to fill the place of Joseph of Constantinople, deceased, that he might confirm their choice. The Greeks, to the first proposal, replied that henceforth they would limit still further the causes of divorce, and grant it only in extreme cases; to the second, that they would inflict adequate punishment on Marcus Eugenicus after their return; and to the third, that they must decline to comply, since ancient usage required that the patriarch should be elected in Constantinople, and consecrated in the principal church of that city.

That the Pope dealt considerately with the Greeks is evident from the fact that he granted them, among other concessions, permission to retain all their peculiar ecclesiastical customs and usages, their ritual, and even the *marriage of priests*.

That portion of *the Latin text of the decree referring to the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome*, which has been in earlier and more recent times seriously objected to, and even branded as an interpolated reading, has been found, after careful investigation, to be genuine and authentic, and precisely the same with that which, *after much haggling and laborious discussion, was finally agreed upon* by the Latins and Greeks, accepted, and subscribed to by both.[1]

of Florence. The definition given above, on the Primacy, both as to the wording and orthography, runs as follows in that important document:

Ἔτι ὁρίζομεν, τὴν ἁγίαν ἀποστολικὴν καθέδραν καὶ τὸν ῥωμαϊκὸν ἀρχιερέα εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὸ πρωτεῖον κατέχειν, αὐτὸν τε τὸν ρωμαϊκὸν ἀρχιερέα διάδεχον εἶναι τοῦ μακαρίου Πέτρου, τοῦ κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ἀληθῆ τοποτηρητὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ. καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας κεραλὴν καὶ πάντων τῶν χριστιανῶν πατέρα καὶ διδάσκαλον ὑπάρχειν. καὶ αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ μακαρίῳ Πέτρῳ, τοῦ ποιμαίνειν καὶ διϋδύνειν καὶ κυβερνᾶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίω ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ χριστοῦ, πλήρη ἐζουσίαν παραδέδοσθαι. καθ' ὅν τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς κανόσι διαλαμβάνεται.

Item diffinimus sanctam apostolicam sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri Principis Apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium totiusque ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem ecclesiam a domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse quemadmodum etiam in gestis ycumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris Canonibus continetur.

[1] The Acts of the Council, in *Harduin*, T. IX.; *Mansi*, T. XXXI., p. 459 sq.; in *Labbeus* et *Cossart*, T. XIII., penned probably by *Bessarion*. Ἡ ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ ἐ›

Apart from the direct expenses of the Council, Eugene was obliged to make other heavy outlays in behalf of the Greeks, who were gratuitously supported and received each a certain fixed allowance in money. Moreover, he had pledged his word to the Emperor John to provide *speedy and efficient aid against the Turks*, which he was now called upon to furnish. To maintain a garrison at Constantinople,

φλωρεντία σύνοδος διὰ μοναχοῦ Βενεδικτίνου (*P. Nikes*), ἐν ῥώμῃ, 1864. A work was written from a strong Greek partisan bias, entitled, "Vera historia unionis non veræ inter Græcos et Latinos, sive Concilii Florent. exactissima narratio græce scripta per Sylvest. Sguropolum (rather, Syropolum) magnum Ecclesiarcham, qui Concilio interfuit, transtulit in serm. lat. *Rob. Creyghton*, Hag. Com., 1690 f. Against the partisan author and blundering translator, *Leonis Allatii* in Rob. Creygthoni apparatum, version. et notas ad hist. Conc. Florentini scriptam a Sylv. Syrop. exercitationum Pars prior. Rom., 1665, 4to; a pars *posterior* did not make its appearance. Cf. above, the works quoted at the head of this section, of *Hefele, Pichler, Zhismann*, and *Frommann*. *Döllinger's* latest objection (*Augsburg Univ. Gaz.*, Jan. 19, 1870, and *Janus*, Lps., 1869, p. 347) *to the Latin text on the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome* is not new, but merely a repetition of what *Peter de Marca, Maimbourg, Launoy, Natalis Alexander, Bossuet, Febronius*, and others erroneously maintained. In the first place, Döllinger accepted, without investigation, the statement of Archbishop *de Marca* (De concord. sacerdot. et Imper., lib. III., c. 8, nro. 5), and the ex-Jesuit, *Maimbourg* (Traité historique de l'établissement et des prérogatives de l'église de Rome, 1685, chaps. 5 and 20), whilst he maintained that the connecting link of the closing words—"'*Quemadmodum etiam*' in gestis œcum. concilior. et in sacris canonibus continetur"—was a forgery of Bartholomew Abram of Crete, and introduced by him into his historical work. He says that, according to the supposed original Greek text by *Flavio Biondo*, secretary of Pope Eugene IV., it must be read: "Quemadmodum *et* in gestis —— *et* canonibus" (lib. X., decad. 3). He further says that, according to the authorities which Maimbourg *pretends* to have brought to light, the καθ' ὃν τρόπον should be translated by *Juxta* eum modum qui, etc. On the other hand, *Emmanuel Schelstrate*, Tractatus de sensu et auctorit. decreti Constant. conc., 1686, præfat. IV., immediately proved, against de Marca, that in all the manuscript copies of the Florentine Decree of Union, and particularly in the unquestionably original text of Florence, the words "*quemadmodum etiam*" are to be found. Still later, *Anthony Vaira* (De prærogativa Rom. Pont. a Constantinopolit. præsulibus usurpata, Patav., 1704, p. 891) showed that the "*juxta*" was an invention of *Maimbourg*, because every author quoted by the latter has "*quemadmodum*," not "*juxta*." Again, when *Febronius* (De statu eccles., c. V., § 4, n. 5, A. D. 1763) undertook to defend the reading "quemadmodum *et*," he was refuted by *Mamachi* and *Zaccaria* (see below, § 370). Döllinger's reading, which, as has been seen, is the same as that of Febronius, has quite recently been proved to be erroneous in a comprehensive article by *Cecconi* (*Univers*, February 6, 1870), and in an exhaustive work, entitled, "*Criticism of the Florentine Decree of Union*" (Lps., 1870), by *Theodor. Frommann*, a Protestant scholar, who resided a long time in Italy. Both of these writers proved that all *original* Latin *documents* and the *numerous duplicate copies*, now extant, of the Florentine decree, and particularly *those* preserved in the libraries and archives of Florence, Rome, Venice, Bologna, Milan, London, and Paris (to which, according to what has been stated at page 89. may be added that of Carlsruhe), contain the "*quemadmodum etiam.*" Hence *Frommann* says: "It is to be regretted (sic!) that the fact (?) on which the assertion of Döllinger mainly rests is entirely without foundation. In all the copies of the decree we have been able to examine, we have uniformly found '*etiam.*'" Frommann agrees with the Civiltà *Cattolica* in its explanation of the probable origin of the reading "*et—et.*" He says: "The *et—et* of Flavio Biondo and the other writers who have followed him may have originated from a mistake of the copyist, who mistook the abbreviated form of *etiam* for *et*. Hence," he concludes, "*Abramus Cretensis, the collectors of councils, and authors of dogmatic text-books*, must be absolved from the imputation (Döllinger's) of having *forged documents*." It also appears, from careful investigation into the *origin* of this final sentence of the decree, that the *Latins* were the authors of the *definitive* portions of it, and that the Greek reading, καθ' ὃν τρόπον, was accidentally substituted for the simple καθώς. "Hence," says Frommann (L. c., pp. 52, 53), "there is not the faintest suspicion that the Latins attempted, from dishonest motives, to corrupt the text." On the other hand, it must be frankly stated here, that during the course of the heated discussion concerning the precise form of this

he contracted with the banking-house of the Medici, in Venice, a loan of 12,000 ducats.[1]

The temper exhibited by the bulk of the Greek people in regard to the act of union in no wise corresponded to the hopeful anticipations of Eugene, and was but a poor compensation for the immense sacrifices and earnest efforts that had been made to effect a reconciliation.[2] Marcus Eugenicus, who had preceded his colleagues to Constantinople, excited the prejudices and appealed to the national antipathies of the people; while the emperor, naturally weak and vacillating, but now borne down with grief on account of the death of his third empress, Mary Comnena of Trebisond, unnecessarily deferred the election of a patriarch. This delay greatly contributed to exasperate the more uncompromising, and to excite disorders among the populace.

The former complained that the signers of the Florentine Decree had attempted to Latinize the Greeks, and the latter that they had put their trust in the Latins instead of God Almighty. So intense was the fury of the populace, that they went about the city shouting: "Away with the Azymites! the Blessed Virgin will not allow our city to be destroyed; we have no need of the Latins; we had rather be under the Turks than the Romans."

The promulgation of the Decree was the occasion of excited demonstrations in the churches and of riotous tumult in the streets. The Basilica of St. Sophia was believed to have been desecrated by the ceremony. The internal peace of the empire was seriously threatened and its power of resistance to the Turks greatly impaired. The new Patriarch, *Metrophanes* of Cyzicus, in spite of the energy displayed in his efforts to carry the articles of the Florentine Decree into effect amid scenes of violence, was unable to withstand the tide of popular feeling, or to make head against the opposition of his adversaries. The leader of these was *Arsenius*, Metropolitan of Cæsarea in Cappodocia, who, together with the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, assembled at the last-named city (1442-43), drew up and published two documents, in one of which, bearing the date of April, 1443, they summoned, under menace of

closing definition of the decree, the Greek emperor and his theologians stubbornly refused to admit the *papal prerogatives "as they are expressed in Holy Scriptures and in the writings of the saints;"* because, they said, the testimonies of the latter (relative to the primacy of the Pope) are doubtful or unauthenticated—sometimes too rhetorical, and not unfrequently conveyed in the complimentary phraseology of correspondence. Hence they demanded that the sense of the definition should be: "The Pope enjoys his prerogatives as defined by the *canons and the acts of œcumenical councils*," an amendment to which the Latins finally agreed. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand how, on the one hand, the Greeks fancied they had depressed, and, on the other, the Latins that they had exalted the primacy of the Pope by this last clause. Cf. *Hergenröther*, The "Errors" of above Four Hundred Bishops and their Theological Censor (Döllinger), Freiburg, 1870.

[1] Cf. *Frommann*, Critical Supplements towards a History of the Church Union of Florence, Halle, 1872, pp. 188-190.

[2] The *same*, L. c., pp. 191-239, brings many, and, in part, new details on the vicissitudes of the union until its dissolution, which particulars, however, frequently call for a careful revision and amendment

excommunication, all ecclesiastics appointed by the Patriarch Metrophanes to at once leave off exercising their functions; and in the other, issued December, 1442, threatened to omit the name of the emperor in the prayers of the Church, unless he would denounce the Synod of Florence and exert his influence to have the Latins strike out the "*Filioque*" from the Symbol. Before the emperor, now engaged in a war against the despotic Demetrius, who was opposed to the union, could convoke a counter synod at Constantinople, the Patriarch Metrophanes died (August 1, 1443). This event postponed indefinitely the consummation of the act of union. In 1445, *Gregory Mammas*, one of the ablest defenders of the Greek cause at Florence, but now an advocate of union, was raised to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople. Being a man of character and strong will, his opponents were naturally anxious to be rid of him, and accordingly, after the death of the Emperor John (October 31, 1448), he was deposed under the new Emperor, *Constantine*, in a synod held at Constantinople in 1450. His successor, *Athanasius*, after the sudden death of Marcus Eugenicus, found an equally zealous and vehement advocate of the cause of opposition in *George Scholarius*.[1] The Emperor Constantine, being honestly desirous of putting down all opposition to the union, frustrated the efforts of Athanasius and Scholarius; and the former, in consequence, resigned the patriarchate; and the latter, under the assumed name of Gennadius, retired to the quiet of the cloister.

Bessarion, deeply afflicted by the hostility of the Byzantine clergy to the Florentine Decree, withdrew from Constantinople and took up his residence in Rome—a step which he was all the more ready to take inasmuch as he had been created a cardinal. Gregory, the deposed Patriarch, had also gone to Rome to work as best he could in the interest of his country.

Nicholas V., Eugene's successor, continued to send aid for the prosecution of the war against the Turks, and the better to interest the West in behalf of their menaced brethren of the East, sought to arrange for a demonstration at Constantinople, whose object would be the public recognition of the Florentine Decree. For this purpose, he sent to Constantinople, Isidore, the Metropolitan of Kiew, who, having been exiled for his advocacy of the union, sought refuge at Rome, where, like Bessarion, he had been created a cardinal. He was selected because, being a Greek by birth, and intimately acquainted with the internal affairs of his native country, he seemed best qualified to improve the circumstances which now appeared to favour a reconciliation between the East and West. His special

[1] *Leo Allatius*, when engaged in writing his work—De ecclesiæ occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consensione—received the acts of this synod, and had them printed (p. 1380 sq.) in the appendix to his work, declaring, however, and justly so, that on account of gross anachronisms and intrinsic contradictions, he considered them counterfeit. (See *Hefele*, Tübg. Quart., 1848, p. 212). The fact of the *existence*, however, *of that synod* cannot well be called into doubt. Cf. *Frommann*, Crit. Suppl., p. 222 sq.

mission was to bring the emperor and the majority of the clergy to acknowledge, as soon as possible, by some public act, the articles of the Florentine Decree; and in this he was successful, and on the 12th of December, 1452, celebrated the Feast of Union in the Church of St. Sophia, and there offered public prayer for the Pope and for *Gregory*, the exiled Patriarch. On receipt of this news, Nicholas made fresh efforts to succour the East, and sent a fleet to the defence of Constantinople, which, unfortunately, did not arrive until the city, after a gallant struggle, had yielded to the desperate onset of the Turks, May 29, 1453. The brave and noble Constantine XI., the last of the Palæology, perished in the thick of the fight. The splendid Church of St. Sophia was speedily transformed from a Christian temple to a Turkish mosque. Cardinal Isidore, who had been an eye-witness of the storming and sack of the city of Constantine,[1] and had barely escaped with his life, gave a detailed account of the disaster when he arrived at Rome.

As the Greek emperor's attachment to the union had operated effectually in securing aid from the West, his victorious conqueror, Mohammed II., did all in his power, consistent with his own interests, to oppose the union, and for the twofold purpose of carrying out this policy and conciliating the Christians, on the fourth day after the taking of Constantinople, had the monk *Gennadius*, who was hostile to the Florentine Decree, placed on the patriarchal throne. Gennadius, thus placed in the highest position in the Greek Church, won the confidence of the Sultan, and thereby secured many privileges and immunities for his fellow-Christians; but in his determined hostility to Rome he never changed. He withdrew, after some years, to the solitude of the cloister, where he died in 1464. His successors in the patriarchal office, Isidore II., Joseph II., and *Symeon* of Trebisond, were equally averse to any reconciliation with Rome, and the last-named convoked a synod at Constantinople in 1472, which denounced the Florentine Decree in harsh and uncompromising language.[2]

When information of the reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches reached the Asiatic tribes, many of them entered into negotiations looking towards a return to Rome.[3] Pope Eugene, in consequence of these overtures, caused the Council of Florence to remain in session after the departure of the Greeks, August, 26, 1439.

In the interval, a permanent union was brought about, first with

[1] Cf. *Hefele*, in his third art., "Temporary Reunion," etc. (Tübg. Quart., 1848, p. 224 sq.)

[2] Concerning the apostasy from the union, rich materials relative to the more important details are to be found in the Τόμος καταλλαγῆς, published at Jassy (1692-1694), by *Dositheus*, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and chiefly composed of the writings of those who opposed the union and of acts of synods held for the same purpose. Of this work, however, little is generally known. Cf. *Gams*, *Möhler's* Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 644, note 1, and *Simonides*, 'Ορθοδόξων 'Ελλήνων θεολ. γραφαί, London, 1865. (Fragments from the Correspondence of the Patriarch Gennadius).

[3] Cf. *Wilh. Tyr.*, lib. XXII., c. 8. *Bonn* Review, nro. 16, p. 232 sq., and nro. 17, p. 239 sq. †*Kunstmann*, The Maronites and their relation to the Latin Church (Tübg. Quart. Rev., 1845, nro. 1, pp. 40-54).

the *Maronites*, and next with the *Armenians* (1440), to whom Pope Eugene issued a comprehensive doctrinal decree, and permitted them the use of their own language in the liturgy.[1] Their example was rapidly followed by the *Jacobites* and the Christians of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Chaldea.[2] The Council was transferred (April 26, 1442), to the Lateran in Rome, where it gradually decreased in numbers, and finally terminated in 1445.

Amid the general defection of the Greek Church in its two great representative branches of Constantinople and Moscow, occasioned by the Florentine Decree, the accession of these isolated but not unimportant Asiatic churches, afforded some consolation, but was far from compensating for the loss sustained. Neither was the action of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who, in 1460, and on a subsequent occasion, declared in favour of union, of much significance, since their action was prompted by political rather than religious motives, inasmuch as they hoped, through the efforts of *Pius II.*, to obtain their deliverance from the yoke of the Turks.[3]

CHAPTER II.

HERESIES AND HERETICAL SECTS.

§ 279. *John Wickliffe* (A. D. 1324-1384).

Writings of John Wycliff, Lond., 1836. *Henricus de Knyghton* (Canon of Leicester and Wickliffe's contemporary), De eventibus Angliæ usque ad a. 1395 (*Twisden*, Scriptor. Histor. Angl., Lond., 1652 f.)—*Thom. Walsingham* (Benedictine of St. Alban's, about 1440), Hist. Anglica major. (*Camdeni*, Scriptores rerum Anglicarum, Lond., 1574; Frcf., 1602 f.) The two principal works: *Lewis*, Hist. of the life and sufferings of J. Wicliff, Lond. (1720); Oxf., 1836. *Rob. Vaughan*, Life and opinions of John de Wycliffe, Lond. (1829), 1831, 2 T. Both these works have been written from an altogether Protestant point of view. Conf. also *Ruever Gronemann*, Diatribe in J. W. reformationis prodromi vitam, ingenium, scripta, Traj., 1837. *Weber*, Hist. of the non-Catholic churches and sects in Great Britain, Lps., 1845. The errors of Wickliffe are methodically exposed by *Staudenmaier*, in his Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 667-682. *Pluquet*, Dict. des Hérésies, art. J. Wickliffe, Paris, 1847. **Schwab*, Gerson, pp. 528-546. *Wm. Shirley*, Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri J. Wyclif (ed. 1858).

THE opposition which the sectaries had offered to the Church during the preceding epoch assumed a more marked and determined character

[1] Cf. the Acts, in *Harduin*, T. IX., pp. 1015-1018, and *Labbei et Cossart.* Conc., T. XIII., p. 1197 sq. The *Decretum pro Armenis*, also in *Denzinger's* Enchiridion symbolor. et definitionum. Cf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Counc., Vol. VI., p. 569 sq.

[2] The Acts, in *Labbei* et *Cossart.* T. XIII., p. 1204 sq. *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1021 sq. The Decretum pro Jacobitis, also in *Denzinger*, L. c.; the Decretum pro Syris et pro Chaldæis et Maronitis, in *Labb.* et *Cossart.*, T. XIII., p. 1222 sq. *Harduin*, T. IX., p. 1041 sq.

[3] Cf. *Le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, T. II., p. 770.

in the present. This was especially noticeable in the case of *John Wickliffe*, who seems to have been the representative of every false principle of philosophy and every erroneous doctrine of theology current during this age throughout the Church of the West.

He was born at Wickliffe on the Tees, in Yorkshire, A. D. 1324, and at the age of sixteen was sent to Oxford, where he studied Aristotelian philosophy, scholastic theology, and laws, under Thomas Bradwardine. He possessed an extensive knowledge of Holy Scripture, was a skilful dialectician, and an astute and subtle reasoner. While still a youth he is said to have predicted the approaching downfall of the Church, in the apocalyptic language of the abbot *Joachim de Floris*. Wickliffe became more bold as time went on, and when, in 1350, Edward III., King of England, attempted by Act of Parliament to set aside the right of suzerainty conferred by John Lackland on Pope Innocent III., he wrote a dissertation, the object of which was to prove that the tribute hitherto paid to Rome by the English nation, was entirely without sanction of law. He moreover preached a sermon, in which he styled the Pope "Antichrist, the arrogant and worldly priest of Rome, and the accursed extortioner."

Wickliffe, in 1360, entered with acrimonious bitterness upon the controversy which the University of Oxford was carrying on against the Mendicant Orders, in the course of which he said, that to enter an Order of begging friars, and to forego all hope of heaven, were acts of equivalent import.

The zeal which he had exhibited in resisting the claims of the Pope to the right of tribute from the English nation, gained him the favour of the crown, and in the year 1372, he took the degree of Doctor of Theology, and obtained *a professorship of Divinity* at the University of Oxford.

His name stood second among the royal commissioners sent to Bruges, in 1374, to confer with the papal legates on the questions then in dispute between the Court of Rome and Edward III., King of England. Here he became intimate with John of Ghent, son of Edward, whom he found to entertain feelings quite as hostile as his own towards the Church. While on this mission he was fully informed of the disordered state of affairs at the Papal Court of Avignon, and on his return to England, lost no time in putting his information to the best account. He proceeded at once to attack the Pope, and was not over nice in his choice of epithets or sparing in the use of invective.

Courtenay, Bishop of London, by order of Gregory XI., summoned him to appear before a synod held at St. Paul's, to answer to nineteen articles drawn up against him, charging him with holding heretical opinions. But this examination came to nothing. John of Ghent, and Lord Percy, Earl Marshal, appeared at the synod in support of Wickliffe, to overawe by their presence any who might be bold or conscientious enough to take action against him. Though their conduct to Courtenay was rude and insolent, this prelate behaved towards

them with mildness and dignity, but their acts at length became so offensive that the populace set upon them with tumultuous violence and forced them to consult for their safety in flight. This put an end to the synod and left things just where they were at starting. These proceedings, though no good came of them, served to embitter the mind of Wickliffe, and it was not till this time that his character as an heresiarch became open and decided.

He maintained that *the judgment of the Church* is *not a necessary condition to certitude in* matters of *faith*, and *that every* individual *Christian is*, by the grace of Christ, absolutely *certain of the truth of what he believes;* that *Holy Scripture*, of which private judgment is the only legitimate and adequate interpreter, is at once the *only source and rule of faith; that there is no* such thing as *transubstantiation* in the Holy Eucharist; and that the papacy and episcopacy are not of divine institution.

He also asserted that any bishop or priest who had fallen into mortal sin could not validly administer the sacraments; that auricular confession is a meaningless and empty ceremony, inasmuch as interior sorrow is quite sufficient for the forgiveness of sins; that if the Pope should chance to be an immoral man, he would thereby pass under the dominion of Satan, and cease to have any authority over the faithful; that the clergy, who possess of the goods of this world are living in direct violation of Holy Writ; that even kings and princes, once they have fallen into grievous sin, should straightway abdicate their authority, as *it is absolutely necessary that one, who would hold power, should be in the state of grace.*[1]

The teaching of Wickliffe, besides favouring *the doctrine of unqualified predestination*, led, when pursued to its limits, to the complete overthrow of the great principles of both civil and ecclesiastical polity, because, *from his point of view, morality and legality were convertible terms*, the former being a condition of the latter.

Moreover, both Wickliffe himself, and his itinerant preachers, whom he called "poor priests," and who went up and down the country inveighing against the wealth of the clergy and the artificial distinctions by which one class of men were set above another, did much to stimulate, if they did not actually inspire, that spirit of revolt which culminated in the peasants' insurrection of 1381. The insurgents were speedily put down, and Wickliffe was summoned in the following year to appear before an assembly of eight bishops and fourteen doctors at the Greyfriars, in London. He refused to obey the citation and brought forward as his excuse and defence the privileges of the University. The assembly went on with its work without him, and,

[1] He arrived at this conclusion *by basing theological doctrine on the practices of feudalism.* He argued that forfeiture is universally admitted to be the just punishment of treason, and that, since every mortal sin is treason against God, the offender should be punished by forfeiting whatever he holds of Him. But, as authority comes from God, this should also be forfeited. (Tr.)

out of twenty-four articles gathered from his writings, ten were branded as *heretical*, and fourteen as *erroneous*.[1]

This decision of the bishops was publicly proclaimed in London, and received the sanction of the civil authority. Wickliffe himself was deprived of his professorship at Oxford by royal order, and both he and his adherents expelled the University. From Oxford he went to the parish of Lutterworth, where he spent the remainder of his days, and died two years later, on the Feast of Innocents, A. D. 1384.[2]

While living in retirement at this country-seat, Wickliffe wrote his principal work, entitled the *Trialogus*,[3]—a work in which his bitter opposition to the Church and her doctrines is most fully and *systematically* developed.[4]

In giving an outline of his system, and of the great principles which imparted to it life and character, it is necessary to keep in view his ideology, which very nearly resembled that of *Amalric de Bena*, and was, therefore, essentially pantheistic.[5] Wickliffe's pantheistic creed may be formulated briefly thus: "*All nature is God; every being is God.*"[6] The following proposition embraces his fundamental notion of the way in which *ideas* are apprehended: "*Anything, the idea of which exists in the mind of God, is God Himself;*" or, "*The idea is God.*" It is indeed difficult to conceive how Wickliffe should not have been struck with the untenableness of his first principles, when he himself was led to conclude, by reasoning from them, that "an ass is God."[7] He even went the length of asserting that the proposition, "God is the idea," or, conversely, "the idea is God," is capable of scriptural proof.[8]

This principle once accepted, his system admitted of easy and rapid development. The *eternal reality* of all things and the *infinite duration of time* followed as necessary consequences; and the assertion of Abelard, that "God could not have created, if He would, a greater number of beings than He in fact did create," was common to Wickliffe also. Creation, according to this doctrine, in as far as God had anything to do with it

---

[1] On this London synod, compare *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 1889 sq.; *Mansi*, T. XXVI., p. 695.

[2] He was assisting at the Mass of his curate, and, at the moment of the elevation of the Host, was deprived of the use of his tongue and most of his limbs by a stroke of apolexy. (Tr.)

[3] *Trialogus;* more full, *Joannis Wiclefi*, viri undequaque püssimi dialogor., lib. IV., Bas., 1525, 4to; ed. *Wirth*, Frcf. et Lps., 1753 (lib. I. de Deo et ideis; lib. II. de creat. mundi; lib. III. de virtutibus et vitiis; lib. IV. de ecclesia, sacramentis, etc.) Concerning his other works, see *Lewis*, p. 143, and especially his treatise, "De ideis."

[4] There is an excellent criticism of Wickliffe in *Thomas Waldensis*, Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei (against the errors of Wickliffe and Huss), ed. Paris, 1521-32 f.; ed. *J. Rubens*, Venet., 1571 f.; ed. *Blanciotti*, Venet., 1757-59 f. Cf. also *Lewald*, Wickliffe's Theological Doctrine (Journal of Historical Theology, 1846 and 1847).

[5] For proofs, see *Staudenmaier*, L. c., yet frequently misinterpreted and misapplied. More solidly and correctly given in *Schwab*, pp. 527-546.

[6] Among the condemned propositions are also found the following: Quælibet creatura est Deus; quodlibet est Deus. Ubique omne ens est, cum omne ens sit Deus, in *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 407. *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 751; besides, compare *Harduin*, T. VII., pp. 1867, 1870 sq., 1890 sq.; T. VIII., pp. 203, 260, 263, 280, 299 sq., 909 sq., 1675; Tom. IX., pp. 1929-1945.

[7] Wickliffe's own words: Et si dicatur, quod male sonat, concedere *asinum* et quodlibet aliud esse Deum, conceditur apud ægre intelligentes, ideo multi non admittunt talia, nisi cum determinatione, ut talis creatura secundum esse intelligibile, vel ideale quod habet in Deo ad intra, est Deus. Illi autem, qui habent eundem sensum per subjectum per se positum, æque concedunt propositionem simplicem. De ideis, c. 2.

[8] Unde sic converto istam propositionem: omnis creatura est Deus. Deus est quælibet creatura in esse intelligibili, et istam conversionem videtur Apostolus docere nos, ubi non dicit absolute, quod Deus est omnia, sed cum additamento: Deus est omnia in omnibus, ac si diceret: ***Deus est omnes rationes ideales in omnibus creaturis.*** De ideis c. 2.

at all, was but an *emanation, and whatever did take place,*[1] the evil as well as the good, *took place by a law of necessity,* and could not have happened otherwise than it did. God Himself is the creature of this law, and his freedom of action is no more than a willing acceptance of the conditions which it lays upon Him. Necessity is therefore implied in the very conception of a God. It is, as it were, a condition of his being. But if both Creator and creature are so hemmed about by the law of necessity as to be completely and hopelessly under its control, it follows that there is such a thing as an *eternal, absolute,* and unqualified *predestination,* and, if so, to speak of the free-will of either God or man is arrant nonsense. Nor is this all. If *everything is under the law of absolute necessity, this must not be left out of sight in putting an estimate upon the work accomplished by Christ,* and in forming a judgment upon the whole history of the world.

Wickliffe delighted in putting a sinister interpretation upon everything, in attributing everything to an evil influence. In his judgment, all the scientific and literary institutions established after the tenth century, and particularly the religious orders, which, he said, had been shaken from the tail of the great dragon, were diabolical in origin, pagan in character, and in the prosperity of which the Church and the Devil were about equally interested.[2]

Although Wickliffe made his translation of the Bible from the Vulgate, and introduced into it the poison of his errors with the special purpose of disseminating these among the people, it is a little remarkable that the great bulk of his adherents were from among the better classes. His followers were designated by the name of *Lollards,* and during the reign of Henry V., who acted by the advice of the Carmelite, *Thomas Waldensis* (†A. D. 1431), they were pursued with such energy as to be almost entirely suppressed. Their errors, however, were again revived in Bohemia, and, on this account, the Council of Constance passed sentence of anathema upon Wickliffe many years after his death.

§ 280. *John Huss* (1373-1415)—*The Hussites.*[3]

Mistra Jana Husi, Spisy ceské, etc. (Master John Huss' complete works, in the Bohemian language), published, for the first time, by *K. J. Erben,* Prague, 1865-66. So far, fourteen numbers have appeared. —— Historia et monumenta J. Huss et Hieronym. Prag., etc., Norimbergæ, 1558, 1715, 2 T. *Stumpff,* The Great General Council of Constance, etc., see above, § 271. Act of Councils, in *von der Hardt,* cf. literature heading, § 271. *Harduin,* T. VIII.; *Mansi,* T. XXVII. *Cochlæus,* Hist. Hussitarum, Mogunt., 1549. †*Höfler,* Historians of the Hussite Troubles in Bohemia, Vienna, 1856-66, 3 vols. *Palacky,* Hist. of the Bohemians, Vol. III., especially Pts. II. and III. *Helfert,* Huss and Jerome, Prague, 1853. *Henke,* John Huss and the Synod of Constance, Brl., 1869. Cf. *Hist. Polit. Papers,* Vol. 31, p. 350 sq.; Vol. 39, pp. 699-724; Vol. 41, pp. 529-558; and *Bonn* Review of Theol. Lit., 1870, p. 422 and pp. 675-679. *Schwab,* Gerson, pp. 546-608. *E. Bonnechose,* Réformateurs avant la Reformation du XVIème siècle: Jean Hus, Gerson et le Concile de Constance, IIIème ed., Paris, 1860. †* *Berger,* John Huss and King Sigismund, Augsburg, 1871, with complete bibliography.

Three causes contributed to the Hussite movement in Bohemia: the eager desire of the nobility to get possession of the wealth of the clergy; the false mysticism into which the teachings, at first free from all tinge of error, of the parish priest, *Conrad Waldhauser,* of the archdeacon, *Milicz* of Kremsier, and his disciple, *Matthias* of

[1] He says, without figure: Cum omnia, quæ eveniunt, *de necessitate* eveniunt, absolute necessarium est, quod damnandus ponat obicem in peccando (Trialog., lib. III., c. 7, 23; lib. IV., c. 13). Recolo me dixisse in libro I., quod omnia, quæ eveniunt, necessario absolute eveniunt (lib. III., c. 8). Conf. *Harduin,* T. VIII., p. 407; *Mansi,* T. XXVII., p. 751.

Omnes religiones (of monks) *indifferenter introductæ sunt a diabolo.* — Universitates, studia, collegia, graduationes et magisteria in eisdem sunt vana gentilitate introducta, et tantum prosunt ecclesiæ sicut diabolus. (*Harduin,* T. VIII., pp. 300, 301. *Mansi,* T. XXVII., pp. 633, 634, namely, Sess. VIII. Conc. Constant.

[3] We still retain here the customary English spelling of this name with a double *ss,* although it is *Hus* in Bohemian, and means a goose, whereas Huss would, by a Czech, be pronounced like Hush. *Hefele's* art. in the *Freiburg* Cyclopædia, V. 402. (Tr.)

Janow, eventually developed; and, finally, the theological controversy occasioned by the surreptitious introduction of the writings of *Wickliffe* into the University of Prague. Such were the materials ready at hand to which *Huss* set the torch, and which shortly supplied abundant fuel for a mighty conflagration.

Born July 6, 1369, at Hussinecz, a village of Bohemia, situated within the circle of Prachin, and close to the Bavarian border, Huss studied philosophy and theology at the University of Prague, where he took the master's degree in 1396, and became professor in 1398. Here the contests, which had arisen between the Germans and Czechs for the enjoyment of the burses, were then heated and acrimonious. Huss was next chosen dean of the philosophical faculty, and appointed preacher at the Bethlehem Chapel, founded for the Bohemians, where sermons were delivered only in the *vulgar* tongue.

A forged document, purporting to be the approval of Wickliffe's orthodoxy by the University of Oxford, and bearing the official seal of that institution, was brought to Prague and publicly read. On the authority of this fraudulent document, the writings of Wickliffe were scattered through the city, and their teachings embraced by Huss and his disciples.

Among the most ardent advocates of the new teachings were the noblemen, *Nicholas Faulfisch* and *Jerome of Prague*. Huss translated the *Trialogus* into Bohemian; but, being deficient in speculative powers, he could neither appreciate the full import of the original, nor defend the ultimate consequences to which its principles would lead. Though lacking the ability to make the doctrines of Wickliffe his own in any adequate sense, as is notably the case in those on the personality of Christ and unconditional predestination, he nevertheless declared, in the dictatorial tone and coarse language so characteristic of him, that the censures passed upon the writings of that heretic were false and unjust. He took occasion in his *sermons*[1] to praise the teachings of Wickliffe, to excite the people against the clergy, and to commend the laudable avocation of two young Englishmen, who sought to rouse popular feeling against the hierarchy, and, for the furtherance of their cause, had recourse to the exhibition of obscene pictures. His fiery denunciation of the Pope and ecclesiastical abuses were so violent as to sometimes excite the indignation of his audience. He was once stopped in one of those furious philippics, of which he gave so many, by a man who cried out to him: "Master, I have been in Rome, have seen the Pope and the cardinals, but affairs are not so bad as you represent." "And if you are so great an admirer of the Pope," said Huss, "you would do well to go back to Rome." To which the other responded: "I am now too far advanced in years to again undertake the journey; but as you are still young, you should go, for you will there learn that things are not exactly as you say."

[1] Huss' Sermons, translated into German by *Nowotny*, Gœrlitz, 1854, three numbers.

Sbinko, Archbishop of Prague, had time and again warned Huss to moderate the vigour of his language, but, these friendly admonitions proving fruitless, was eventually obliged to take more decided measures against him.

Wenceslaus, who had been deprived of the German crown to make room for *Rupert* of the Palatinate, whose claims Gregory XII. recognized, now desired to join the *conciliabulum* of Pisa, which promised to declare him King of Rome. But to this the Archbishop of Prague, who, holding Gregory to be the lawful Pope, yielded him a willing obedience, refused to assent, and was supported in his resolution by the action of the university. Huss, on the other hand, being influential at court, and enabled, through his friend Jerome, to interest the higher classes in favour of the project, persuaded King Wenceslaus to pass a law (1409) granting *three* votes at the university to the Bohemian nation and only *one* to the foreign nations, consisting of the Bavarian, Saxon, and Polish, half of the last-named nation being Silesians. These nations, in consequence, immediately quitted Prague, and from this time dates the foundation of the Universities of Leipsic and Rostock, and the augmentation of that of Cracow.[1] The Archbishop, yielding to force, complied with the royal pleasure and attended the Synod of Pisa. His enemies, elated by their success, impeached his orthodoxy at the court of *Alexander V.* The ruse, however, was not successful. Upon the representation of the Archbishop that the disciples of Wickliffe were doing all in their power to disseminate his errors, Alexander V. issued a bull, in 1409, commissioning him to proceed against the heretics, and authorizing him to prohibit preaching outside of parish, collegiate, and conventual churches. The latter clause was a direct blow at Huss, who, being thus threatened in his most efficient agency for sowing the seeds of error, protested against it and against the order of the Archbishop for the burning of Wickliffe's writings. As Huss had appealed to Rome, he was now cited by John XXIII. to appear in person and defend his cause; but, after shuffling about and evading the summons under various flimsy pretexts, he openly refused to obey, and was cut off from the communion of the Church in 1411. Many of his former friends, astonished at seeing him go so far in the advocacy of Wickliffe's teaching as to set at naught the authority of the Church, broke with him once and for all.

Huss and his friend, Jerome of Prague, now threw off all pretence of respect for authority. John XXIII. had just published a crusade against Ladislaus, King of Naples, and granted an indulgence to those who should take part in it. So excellent an opportunity to revile the papacy could not be allowed to pass unimproved, and accordingly Huss and Jerome made it the occasion of the most violent and indecent assaults upon papal authority. Jerome led off by arranging a

[1] *Höfler*, Master John Huss, and the departure, in 1409, of the German professors and students from Prague, ibid., 1862.

public *disputation, the object of which was to ridicule the bull of indulgences*, after which Huss and himself assailed it in language the most vituperative, and finally consigned it to the flames. In spite of the efforts of his friends at court in his behalf, Huss was for this act expelled the city of Prague. Now an exile, he sought an asylum first with one nobleman and then with another, but was always careful to spread his errors, whenever an opportunity offered, by preaching in the open fields to the people of the neighbouring country. It was during this time that he wrote his TRACTATUS DE ECCLESIA, the most important of all his writings, and in its aim, notwithstanding the author's attempts to explain away its most offensive features, entirely subversive of Church government.

The *letters* addressed by him, during his absence, to his friends in Prague, afforded more abundant evidence of his furious hatred of the Pope and the clergy than anything he had previously written or said. The outrages against the clergy were so violent, and the conduct of the Grubenheimers so notorious and scandalous, that Bohemia came to be popularly spoken of as the land of heretics, though Huss maintained that *no true Bohemian had ever merited so opprobrious an epithet.*

Rome could no longer resist the reiterated and constantly increasing complaints of the clergy, who were, moreover, supported by the powerful influence of the University of Paris, and instructions were accordingly sent to King Wenceslaus and the Archbishop of Prague to put forth every energy in suppressing the growing disorders. The listless monarch, now fully roused to a sense of his duty, sought to preserve the fair fame of his name and country, and was ably assisted in the good work by his step-brother, Sigismund, the heir-apparent to the throne. They prevailed upon Huss to go to *Constance*, where the *Council* was then in session, and defend his doctrines—a course, they urged, which could not be objectionable to him, as he had frequently appealed to the verdict of an œcumenical council. Under pretext of protecting him while on his journey, the emperor provided him with an escort of three Bohemian knights, named John of *Chlum*, Wenzel of *Duba*, and *Lacembok*. He also received a safe-conduct, issued at Spires, October 18, 1414, and he now saw himself, as he expressed it in a letter to Sigismund, obliged "*to bend his neck.*"

After his return to Prague, Huss made public declaration through the inquisitor of the archdiocese of Prague, disclaiming every heresy imputed to him, and public notices were affixed to all the churches and to the royal palace, to the effect that "anyone desiring to bring action in matters concerning faith, against John Huss, should present their charges before the Council of Constance." He also published a second notice, declaring that, "if he should (previously to the Council) be convicted of any error, or of having taught aught contrary to faith, he would be ready to undergo the punishment of a heretic."[1]

[1] Porro, si me de errore aliquo convicerit, et me aliena a fide docuisse probaverit, non recusabo, *quascunque hæretici pœnas ferre* (acta Hussii, fol. 2). But, for all this, Huss ad-

Accompanied by the three knights, a cavalcade of thirty horsemen, and two carriages, Huss set out for Constance, October 11, 1414, where he arrived November 3rd, two days before the opening of the Council, and retired to his lodgings to await the emperor's safe-conduct, which should have been forwarded from Spires in time to reach him on his arrival at Constance.[1] Huss was thus doubly secured, having, besides the *protection* afforded by the three knights, the *written* safe-conduct of the emperor. To provide against any inconvenience arising from ecclesiastical restriction, Pope John XXIII. removed from him, temporarily, the sentence of excommunication, gave him leave to live in a private house, to go about freely, and to visit the churches, putting no further restraint upon him than the inhibition to either say Mass or preach.

His two accusers, *Michael de Causis* and *Stephen Palecz*, both Bohemians, in the meantime had, by putting together numerous extracts from his writings, drawn up a formal indictment of heresy against him, which they laid before the Pope and the Council. It was thought necessary, pending the ecclesiastical trial, not to expose Huss to external influence, and he was accordingly, on the 28th of November, placed in honourable confinement in the residence of a canon of Constance, whence he was transferred, in January, 1415, to a Dominican convent situated on the shores of the Lake of Constance. Apart from this precaution, which it was thought proper to employ under the circumstances, Huss had really exposed himself to such treatment by an utter disregard of the inhibition to say Mass and preach; but that his confinement was far from being rigorous is amply shown by the fact that he composed in the interval many theological treatises, maintained an active correspondence with his friends in the city and at a distance; and in his letters freely advocated and discussed his erroneous tenets, and frequently animadverted with acrimonious severity upon the action of the Council, and the motives of those who had brought charges against him.[2]

John XXIII. fled from Constance, March 21st; and as this event inspired Huss and his friends with hopes of securing his freedom, and in this way his escape from the city, he was removed, on the morning of March 22nd, from the Dominican convent to the castle of Gottlieben, where his confinement was more rigid. The Knight of Chlum protested that, in virtue of the safe-conduct granted Huss, he had a right to his freedom *at least until* such time as *the trial* should open; and the Emperor Sigismund was also inclined to favour this opinion, but being informed that Huss had violated his promise, and that the

dressed the emperor in the Council as follows: "May your Gracious Highness know that I came here *freely*, not to defend anything stubbornly, but to amend, if I am taught better."

[1] For the original text, see *Hefele* VII. 1, p. 221, and *Berger*, p. 179 sq., who bring forward many similar letters of safe-conduct, which they briefly review.

[2] After his second audience before the Council, he wrote to his friends in Constance: "They cry out, nearly all of them, like the Jews against our Master, Christ." This was after he had been led back to prison. Opp. I., fol. 69, 2; ep. 36. (Tr.)

Council insisted on its right to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction after the established form, he withdrew his objections. To conduct a *trial of this kind publicly*, would have been a deviation from precedent and established usage; but though strangers were excluded, Huss himself was treated with mildness and consideration. *Peter d'Ailly* and *Zabarella* served on the commission that conducted the process. A most careful and searching investigation was opened; the witnesses were sworn and examined in presence of the accused; and their depositions, together with the acts of a former trial, formed the basis of the judgment to be rendered. Huss had promised to submit to the decision of the Council, and in the early stage of the proceedings it seemed that he would hold to his word; but his sensitive and morbid pride for the fair name of Bohemia and its people, who, he professed to believe, had never been tainted with error, forbade him to make the sacrifice.[1]

The forty-five propositions of Wickliffe had been condemned by the Council, in its eighth session, held May 4th, and in the early part of June, Huss was notified to prepare for *public* trial, *which had been granted him chiefly through the persistent efforts of the Emperor Sigismund.* Huss had three public hearings before the Council, in the general congregations held respectively on the 6th, 7th, and 8th of June. He steadfastly refused to retract the propositions imputed to him, declaring that some of them he had never taught; that others were distorted and proposed in a perverse sense; and that he was prepared to discuss such as he really held, and would abjure only when "texts of Scripture subversive of them" should have been adduced. In the second general congregation the emperor, who was present, frequently interrupted the order of the proceedings, and took occasion to tell Huss, when the latter had refused to recant anything, that the letter of *safe-conduct* could in no wise interfere with the verdict of the Council. *I have redeemed my promise,*" the emperor continued; "*if you obstinately persist in defending your errors, the Council has its rights and laws, according to which it must proceed against you. As for myself I had rather prepare with my own hands the faggots for your burning than protect your errors.* I therefore advise you to submit to the decision of the Council, and the sooner you do it the better." In the third general congregation a form of recantation was proposed to him, in which he was required to say that he "*abjured his errors;*" but this he refused to take, and he also stubbornly repelled other and well-meant efforts on the part of the bishops and the emperor to bring about a reconciliation. It was intended, had he recanted, to place him in honourable custody, and to deal with him as Abelard had been dealt with in a former age. This was also the course proposed by the emperor, who, growing indignant at Huss' obstinacy, but still more at his assertion that those in authority ceased to have jurisdiction while in mortal sin,[2] now abandoned him alto-

[1] Cf. *Schwab*, John Gerson, pp. 592, 593.

[2] "Nullus est dominus civilis, nullus est prælatus, nullus est episcopus, dum est in peccato mortali," in *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 755. The Council, in its fifteenth session con-

gether. He also stated that heretofore he had been in no condition to form a correct opinion of the Hussite movement, but that he could now say "*there never was a more mischievous heretic than Huss.*"[1] After every attempt to induce him to retract his errors had failed, he was, on July 6th, brought before the *fifteenth general session* of the Council, held in the Cathedral of Constance, to receive judgment. Thirty propositions, drawn chiefly from his *Tractatus de Ecclesia*, were condemned, of which the following are the most remarkable:

1. The members of the *Church* consist wholly of the *prædestinati*, or of those predestined to everlasting happiness, who can no more cease to be of her fold than the *præsciti*, or those foredoomed to eternal misery, can enter it. 2. There is no Head of the Church other than Christ; and to say *either that the Church militant has need of a visible head*, or that Christ instituted such, is to assert what cannot be proved. 3. The *papacy* owes its origin solely to *imperial favour and authority*. 4. *The claim of the Church to the obedience* of her members is *a pure invention of priests*, and contrary to Holy Scripture. Hence, 5. When the conscience of a priest bears witness to his purity of motive and uprightness, he should not be deterred from preaching by papal injunction or frightened by sentence of excommunication. 6. But, on the other hand, *anyone invested with either temporal or spiritual authority, when satisfied by the witness of his conscience that he is in mortal sin, in that moment loses all power and jurisdiction* over Christian people, and must lay down his office. 7. *Holy Scripture* is the *sole* source and rule of Christian faith, a doctrine which Wickliffe also taught. The teaching of Huss *on the Blessed Eucharist* seems to have been orthodox; and neither was he the author of *Utraquism* or the receiving of the Eucharist under both species. He also admitted *seven* sacraments, taught that veneration should be paid to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, and stoutly defended the celibacy of the clergy.[2]

The duty of the Council under the circumstances was plain: it condemned these doctrines as heretical and dangerous, and it could not have done less. As a consequence the works of Huss were ordered to be burned. The Council, after having deposed and degraded him (July 6th), had no further jurisdiction over him, and transferred him to the *civil* authorities, with the prayer, which the Church had used on such occasions for centuries, "that his life be spared, and he be condemned to perpetual imprisonment."[3] By the laws of the empire one convicted of heresy, in that age a *civil* offence, and refusing to abjure, was to be punished with death; and hence, unless an exception were made in Huss' case, he too must undergo the penalty. But apart from the offence of heresy, Huss had been guilty of serious

demned also the following propositions as heretical: "Quilibet tyrannus potest et debet licite et meritorie occidi per quemcunque vassallum suum vel subditum, etiam per clanculares insidias, et subtiles blanditias vel adulationes, non obstante quocumque præstito juramento, seu confœderatione factis cum eo, non exspectata sententia vel mandato judicis cujuscumque. See *Balmes*, Prot. comp. with Cath. Ch. LVI. (Tr.)

[1] In *Höfler*, Vol. I., p. 257.

[2] In *Mansi*, T. XXVII., pp. 754, 755. Cf. †*Cappenberg*, Utrum Hussii doctrina fuerit hæretica et merito ab ecclesia catholica anathemate proscripta nec ne? Monast., 1834. †*Friedrich*, The Doctrine of John Huss, etc., Ratisb., 1862. *Hefele*, Vol. VII., Pt. I., p. 158 sq. and pp. 194-206.

[3] In *Mansi*, T. XXVII., p. 753, it is said: "Sancta Synodus Joannem Hus, attento quod ecclesia Dei non habeat ultra, quid gerere valeat (quam) *judicio sæculari relinquere*: ipsum curiæ sæculari relinquendum fore decernit." Cf. *John von Müller*, Annot. to his Hist. of Switzerland, Bk. III., ch. 2, nro. 6; and *Schmidt*, Hist of the Germans, Pt. IV., p. 124.

crimes against civil society. He had written libelous documents, made inflammatory speeches, stirred up the people to revolt, given any subject permission to take the life of a tyrant, and made such subject the judge as to what acts properly constituted tyranny in a ruler.[1] Hence, Huss was by his own acts, putting heresy out of the question, within the competence of the civil authority which he sought to undermine and subvert, and it was simply the duty of the latter to protect itself against so furious and dangerous an agitator.

As *Leo* justly remarks: "Others have indeed preached doctrines more bold and aggressive than those of Huss, and followed out in practice what they held in theory, but in doing so they observed the rules proper to such occasions, and not one of them was ever sent to the stake." Did not *St. Peter Damian* and *St. Bernard*, *Petrarca*, *St. Catharine of Siena*, and *St. Bridget* portray the abuses and disorders of the Church, in language the most fiery and energetic, and demand their reformation in terms the most stern and uncompromising, and was not one of these outspoken reformers, St. Bridget, placed upon the roll of saints by the very Council that condemned the doctrines of Huss?

The Church distinguishes, by a kind of divine instinct, the true reformer from the false: reprobates the one and holds the other in honour. "If," says *Moehler*,[2] "one be deeply versed in divine and eternal truths and give unmistakable proof that his life is of a piece with his teachings; if, above all things, he be not self-sufficient, and, therefore, ready to *begin by reforming himself;* if, finally, he bring experience to the support of his views, and prove by his practice his faith in his own advice, then will the Church gladly and thankfully recognize not only his right, but his duty to widen the sphere of his labours, to correct the morals and revive the zeal of the faithful. But if these conditions be absent, if he have nothing better to offer than beautiful but impracticable theories and fine words, then will he be dismissed with merited contempt, and told to go his way." Such was Huss. According to the penalty prescribed by the *civil legislation* of that age, he was burned at the stake (July 6, 1415), and bore his sufferings with a courage and fortitude worthy of a better cause.[3]

The scope and force of the letter of *safe-conduct* issued to Huss, have been greatly misapprehended, and the Emperor Sigismund,[4] in consequence, reproached with violating his word. To form a correct estimate of its character, it will be necessary, besides bearing in mind what has been said above, to examine the letter itself. By the safe-conduct, Huss was taken under the protection of the empire, and commended to officials and all subjects whether spiritual or lay; all are commanded to receive and treat him kindly, and in every way facilitate his progress; he is permitted *to go to and fro* freely where he

[1] See proposition, above on p. 104, n. 2, condemned by the Council. (Tr.)
[2] Miscellanea, Vol. II., p. 25.
[3] Cf. below, the section on the Inquisition, and punishment of heretics.
[4] Conf. *v. d. Hardt*, T. IV., p. 12 sq. and pp. 495-497. See above, p. 103 n. 1.

likes, and, if need be, to have a guard for his protection. The letter was in effect a passport, intended to remove the real or simulated fear of Huss in travelling through Germany, both on his way to and return from Constance, should he be acquitted; but neither he himself nor his friends ever thought of its protecting him against the action of the Council, the supreme ecclesiastical court of judicature.

To entertain so strange a notion would be to render the proceedings of the Council, to whose decision he expressed his willingness to submit until it was evident the decision would be adverse, in the highest degree farsical. Even the *Bohemian nobles*, in the memorial addressed to the Council after he had been imprisoned, claimed only that in virtue of the letter of safe-conduct he was entitled to a *public* hearing and should be allowed to explain his doctrine. They indeed admitted that, "if he were found guilty according to law and by legal procedure, he should be punished as he deserved." And in the vehement and denunciatory address sent to the Council, after the execution, these same Bohemian nobles, so devoted to the memory of Huss, did not by word or syllable intimate that the safe-conduct[1] had been violated, which they certainly would have done had there been the slightest infraction of it. Neither do the words of the Emperor *Sigismund*, already given and again repeated, in reply to the King of Aragon, who had written for information on the point, in which he stated that *a safe-conduct could not exempt one from deserved punishment*,[2] imply that any promise of exemption was contained in the letter. The Council understood the safe-conduct in precisely the same sense as the one issued by itself to *John XXIII.* and *Jerome of Prague*, in each of which it was stated that its bearer should be protected against unlawful violence, but not against the judgment of a competent tribunal of justice. It is therefore unjust and dishonest to accuse the Council, as *Gieseler*[3] has done, of having, in order to clear the emperor of the imputation of violating a safe-conduct issued by himself, enacted a decree declaring that no faith was to be kept with a heretic. This decree, given by Gieseler in an abbreviated form, but in full in the foot-note below,[4] declares *first*, that the Church enjoys

[1] *Histor. Polit. Papers*, Vol. IV., pp. 420-425: "John Huss and his letter of Safe-conduct," and in *Helfert*, p. 199.

[2] See *Hefele*, L. c., p. 114.

[3] *Gieseler*, Ch. Hist., Vol. II., Pt. IV., p. 418; the *Catholic* doctrine on the point in question is quite the reverse of this, and explained well in *Holden*, Analysis fidei, c. 9 (*Braun*, Bibl. regul. fidei, T. II.)

[4] *Præsens St. Synodus* ex quovis salvo conductu, per Imperatorem, reges et alios sæculi Principes hæreticis vel de hæresi diffamatis, putantes eosdem sic a suis erroribus revocare, quocunque vinculo se adstrinxerint, concesso nullum fidei catholicæ, vel jurisdictioni ecclesiasticæ præjudicium generari, vel impedimentum præstari posse sive debere declarat: quominus salvo dicto conductu non obstante liceat judici competenti, ecclesiastico de hujusmodi personarum erroribus inquirere et alias contra eas debite procedere, easdemque punire, quantum justitia suadebit, si suos pertinaciter recusaverint revocare errores, etiamsi de salvo conductu confisi ad locum venerint judicii, alias non venturi: nec sic promittentem, *cum alias fecerit quod in ipso* est, ex hoc in aliquo remansisse obligatum. In *v. d. Hardt*, T. IV., p. 521. Another decree, which the Protestant *v. d. Hardt* found in the codex Dorrianus, and *first* published, has the following: "Quum tamen Joan.

in all spiritual matters, such as heresy, an inherent and wholly independent jurisdiction, and that such jurisdiction being within her competency, she cannot be restrained in the exercise of it by any general principle or special enactment, such as the granting of a safe-conduct, of civil authority; *second*, that, when a prince promises to protect any one, *he is bound to keep to the strict letter of his word*, unless, by so doing, he would violate the right of another—that is, *he is positively bound by his promise and must make it good in so far as he has power to do so*—a sense quite the reverse of what has been ascribed to this decree of the Council. Again, the dramatic scene of Huss pitching away the safe-conduct after his condemnation, and the emperor's blushing,[1] is a *later* fabrication of the Czechs intended to feed the imaginations of the people. *Mladenowicz*, secretary to the Knight of Chlum, the disciple and biographer of Huss, who, had the incident occurred, would have been an eye-witness of it, and would not surely have omitted it, makes no mention of it.[2]

Jerome of Prague, the restless and inconsistent friend of Huss, the philosopher, theologian, and man of the world, was more generally known, and exerted a wider influence than the latter. He acquired a great reputation as a *reformer* among all classes in distant and widely different countries, but chiefly in Bohemia and Moravia. At the universities of Heidelberg, Paris, and other cities, he created much disturbance by his skilful defence and ardent advocacy of the doctrines of Wickliffe. He was arrested and brought to trial at Vienna, for exciting commotions, but escaped by making false representations to the magistrates.[3] In 1410, he appeared at Ofen, before the emperor, who, on the complaint of Archbishop Sbinko of Prague, had him placed under arrest and handed over to the Archbishop of Gran, by whom he was immediately set at liberty. We hear of him again at Prague, which he quitted after the commotions of 1413, paid a visit to King Wladislaus of Poland and Witold, Duke of Lithuania, and sought to persuade the latter to apostatize to the Greek Church. He remained some time at Cracow, and as usual disturbed the public peace.

Returning again to Prague, he learned the imprisonment of his friend, Huss, and resolving to be near him, arrived secretly, and in disguise, at Constance, April 4, 1415, whence he went next day to the small town of Ueberlingen, four miles distant.

Huss fidem orthodoxam pertinaciter compugnans, se ab omni conductu et privilegio reddiderit alienum, nec aliqua sibi fides aut promissio de jure naturali, divino vel humano fuerit in præjudicium catholicæ fidei observanda." From *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* reasons, it is evident that this decree is apocryphal. The signatures invariably affixed to the other decrees are wanting to this, and it seems to have been specially designed to admit of the malicious interpretation that a promise may be given to a heretic *without the least intention of keeping it.*

[1] This is so stated by *v. d. Hardt*, Vol. IV., p. 393: "Hæc cum loqueretur, oculos in imperatorem defixos habuit. Ille vero statim vehementer erubuit, atque ejus verecundus tinxerat ora rubor." Transl. from *Neander*'s Ch. Hist., Engl. tr., Vol. V., p. 369.

[2] Cf. *Hefele*, Vol. VII., Pt. I., pp. 254-283.

[3] *Von der Hardt*, 638. (Tr.)

From this place he issued a public notice, stating that if permission were given him to come to Constance and quit it again unmolested, he would answer to any charge of heresy that might be brought against him. Having been denied this, he obtained from the Bohemian knights, residing in Constance, an ample vindication of his course, and set out on his way to Bohemia. The Council, in reply to the public notice of Jerome, published an edict summoning him to appear before that body and defend his doctrine in public session.

Meanwhile, Jerome was arrested at Hirschau, in Suabia. He secured a safe-conduct, protecting his person in every way consistent with justice.[1] On May 23, 1415, he had his first audience of the Council, which, owing to the indignation of the Bohemian knights at the arrest and imprisonment of himself and Huss, was disposed to treat him kindly, and to make every concession consistent with his conduct to bring him to retract his errors. To the various charges brought against him, he replied, like Huss, that he was prepared to abjure them when he should have been taught better. He was delivered to the Archbishop of Riga, and again conducted to prison, whence he was brought a second time before the Council, and, after a number of audiences, finally consented to read a prescribed form of recantation, in the nineteenth session, held September 23, 1415, by which he abjured the heresies of Wickliffe and Huss, together with other errors he himself had taught. Having done all that was required of him, he demanded to be set at liberty, and the commission appointed to try him, headed by Cardinal d'Ailly, acknowledged the justness of the demand; but Palecz, Michael de Causis, and some monks who had come on from Prague, suspicious of his motives, and persuaded that he would at once return to Bohemia and raise fresh disturbances, protested against allowing him to be set at liberty. Jerome had also, in conversation with his friends and others, let fall some expressions which gave colour to the suspicions of his enemies. But the commission, which had acted solely upon the evidence brought forward during the trial, and could take no account of hearsay, offended that its action had been ignored, at once resigned, and refused to have anything more to do in the matter. When the second commission had been appointed, Jerome, refusing to submit to a private examination, demanded a public audience, which was granted him, May 23, 1416. He was required to take an oath to speak the truth, which he declined doing because he did not recognize the authority of the new commission, though it had been appointed by the Council, and had precisely the same sanction as the former one. He was again before the Council on the 27th of May, when he spoke in his own defence, attributing his persecution to the malignity of a corrupt and worldly-minded clergy, who, he said, had been instrumental in putting to death all the great martyrs the world had ever seen; and then,

[1] Ad quod a violentia, justitia semper salva, omnem tibi salvum conductum nostrum quantum in nobis est et fides exigit orthodoxa, tenore præsentium offerimus. Opp. II., f. 350, 351.

reverting to his former recantation, said he wished to withdraw whatever he had said against either Wickliffe or Huss and their teachings; praised the latter in the most extravagant terms; and finally, turning to his judges, summoned them to appear before him on the day of Great Assizes. Forty days were granted him to reconsider his step, and during the interval he was visited by many of the more prominent and holy members of the Council, among whom was Cardinal Zabarella, who used every means that charity and zeal could suggest to prevail upon him to retract, but to no purpose. The Council pronounced sentence upon him May 30th, after which he was handed over to the civil power, and was burned at the stake, "enduring the torments of fire," says Poggio, an eye-witness, "with more tranquillity than was displayed by Socrates in drinking the cup of hemlock."[1]

THE HUSSITE WARS.

Shortly after the departure of Huss and his friend, Jerome of Prague, from the Bohemian capital, *Jacob of Mies*, called Jacobellus on account of his diminutive stature, who had been a professor of philosophy since the year 1400, started, towards the close of the year 1414, the question of Communion under both kinds, maintaining that it was *absolutely necessary* the laity should so receive. In this he went beyond the teaching of Huss, who, while favouring the innovation, desired to introduce it *only with the approbation of the Church*. The practice, which was called *Utraquism*, became the distinctive characteristic of the Hussites, and was embraced by the great bulk of the nobility. To prevent any misapprehension as to the mind of the Church on this question, the Council of Constance, in its thirteenth session, held June 15, 1415, prohibited the administration of the chalice to the laity, and condemned the practice as leading to error.[2] In the meantime, the news of Huss' execution had reached Prague, and its effect upon his partisans was to call forth the most inflammatory denunciations of the act and to raise their indignation to the highest degree.[3] Headed by *Nicholos of Hussinecz* and *John Ziska*, both chamberlains of King Wenceslaus, they resolved to main-

[1] *Von der Hardt*, T. III., p. 70. Cf. *Hefele*, Vol. VII., Pt. I., pp. 254-283.

[2] *Conc. Constant.*, Decretum contra communion. sub utraque specie panis et vini (*v. d. Hardt*, T. III., p. 646; T. IV., p. 333. *Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 381 sq. *Mansi*, T. XXVII., 727 sq.). It is said here, of the use of the chalice: "Laudabilem ecclesiæ consuetudinem (sub una specie) rationabiliter approbatam (cf. Vol. I., p. 505, and below, § 293, note *) tanquam sacrilegam damnabiliter reprobare conantur." — The Council, on the contrary, says: "Et sicut hæc consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in primitiva ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, tamen postea a conficientibus sub utraque et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur, cum *firmissime credendum sit* et nullatenus dubitandum, *integrum Christi corpus et sanguinem tam sub specie panis, quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri*. Unde quum hujusmodi consuetudo ab ecclesia et SS. Patribus (especially the schoolmen) rationabiliter introducta et diutissime observata sit, habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare, aut *sine ecclesiæ auctoritate* pro libito mutare."

[3] *Theobald*, Hussite war, 3 ed., 1750, 3 vols. 4to.

vain by force and violence the use of the chalice among the laity. Revolt and anarchy everywhere succeeded to law and order. The new doctrine, which spread rapidly, produced everywhere the same results. A mob of its most enthusiastic advocates marched in procession through the streets of Prague, and, halting before the Senate Hall, forced their way into the building, and, seizing seven of the senators, dashed them headlong out of the window. Nor was this all. Churches and convents were sacked and plundered, and uncouth boors strutted through the city decked out in the rich and costly silk-stuffs thus sacrilegiously obtained.

It at last occurred to the imbecile King Wenceslaus that perhaps it would be just as well to put a stop to these excesses; but, to his astonishment, those who had profaned churches and convents under pretext of zeal in the most sacred of causes, were irreverent enough to withstand even royalty itself. He and those of the monks and priests who opposed Huss barely escaped with their lives by precipitate flight.

In 1419, Nicholas founded on Mount *Hardisstin*, forty-nine miles south-south-east of Prague, the city and fortress of *Tabor*, and gave Communion under both kinds to forty thousand persons. The Calixtines, or the more moderate of the sectaries, had their headquarters in Prague.

The indignation and grief caused by these events hastened the death of King Wenceslaus, August 16, 1419. He was succeeded in the government of Bohemia and Moravia by *Sigismund*, to whom the Calixtines consented, and the Taborites refused to take the oath of allegiance. The latter flew to arms, and, threatening the city of Prague, forced it to participate in their revolt. Sigismund now marched against them with an army of fifty thousand men and a considerable auxiliary force of crusaders, raised by the publication of the bull of Pope Martin, but his efforts were vain against the fanatical zeal of the Hussites. His throne was even declared forfeit (November, 1420).

Ziska, who became their sole leader on the death of Hussinecz, arrogantly demanded the concession of the *four following articles:* 1. The word of God shall be freely preached throughout the kingdom; 2. Communion under both kinds shall be given to all who demand it and are not burdened with mortal sin; 3. The clergy shall give up all property and secular pursuits, and live as did the Apostles; 4. Mortal sin, in either cleric or layman, shall be punished by the civil tribunal. Under the head of mortal sin were comprised drunkenness, theft, the wearing of the tonsure, and the receiving of stipends for Masses.

These articles being rejected by the emperor, the Hussites resolved upon a desperate resistance. They devastated the country far and wide, and kindled afresh the fires of civil war. In 1421, a second army of crusaders entered Bohemia. A great battle was fought at Naby, in which Ziska, already blind of an eye, lost his second, but

succeeded, notwithstanding this untoward accident, in dispersing the crusaders and completely routing the superior army of Sigismund. When the Calixtines of Prague made an offer of the crown to three different foreigners, Ziska threatened to destroy the city if they attempted to carry out this proposal, and was only deterred from making good his threat by the influence of the Hussite theologian, *Rokyczana*, who effected a temporary reconciliation between the parties. Ziska died shortly after (October 12, 1424), and the Hussites, no longer held together by his powerful will, split into four conflicting parties—divided, however, more by political than religious differences. There were the *Taborites*, under *Procope the Elder;* the *Orphans*, under *Procope the Younger;* the *Horebites*, and the *Calixtines* of Prague. Each fought fiercely against the other, and all made incursions into the neighbouring countries. They invaded Saxony, the March of Brandenburg, and Silesia, and menaced the cities of Vienna and Ratisbon. The crusaders sent against them in 1427 and 1431 were as unsuccessful as their predecessors had been.

When the ruinous and fruitless war had gone on for years, the *Council of Basle* considerately interposed and invited the Hussites to a conference (1433), but the latter, when told that the four articles could not be granted without limitations,[1] withdrew, having accomplished nothing. Another conference followed, at which an agreement was entered into, known as the *Compact of Basle*. By this was granted to the Hussites—1. That the word of God should be freely preached, but under the immediate authority of the bishop; 2. That mortal sin should be punished, but by a competent tribunal; 3. That communion under both kinds should be given only to those who had arrived at the age of discretion and earnestly desired it, and who also firmly believed that Christ was received whole and entire (*integer et totus Christus*), under *either* kind, and this the clergy were enjoined to bring frequently before the minds of the people, "for," as the canon goes on to say, "though the Church did, for weighty reasons, suspend the usage of giving *the Chalice to the laity, she may*, as in the present case, *restore it again;*" 4. Finally, that the clergy, while continuing to hold benefices, should apply the revenues to the purposes specified in the canons.[2] The *Calixtines* accepted and the *Taborites* rejected the compact. Again an appeal was made to arms, and at the battle of *Böhmischbrod* (May 30, 1434), the Taborites and the Orphans, under the elder and younger Procopes, suffered a disastrous defeat. They submitted, in the following year, to King Sigismund, and in 1436 the treaty or *Compact of Iglau* was signed, extending to all the Hussites

[1] It is highly important to consult the four discourses delivered in the Council on this article: *Joan. de Ragusa*, De communione sub utraque specie; *Ægidius Carlarius*, De corrigendis publicis peccatoribus; *Henr. Kalteisen*, De libera prædicatione Verbi Dei; *Joan. Polemar*, De civili dominio clericorum. (*Harduin*, T. VIII., pp. 1655-1950; *Mansi*, T. XXIX., pp. 699-1168).

[2] The acts of these negotiations are in *Martène*, Amplissima Collectio, T. VIII., p. 596 sq., and in *Mansi*, T. XXX., pp. 590, 634, 688, and 692.

the concessions of the *Compact of Basle*. This brought peace to the State, but not to the Church.

On the one hand, the Calixtines, now called *Utraquists*, were jealous of their rights and vigilant in their maintenance; while, on the other, the Catholics were desirous of restoring *uniformity* in divine worship, and anxious to abolish an exceptional usage. Both parties being thus sensitively suspicious of each other, and the one ready to repel the most distant invasion of its rights by the other, frequent collisions were inevitable. The efforts of the eloquent and holy *John Capistrano*, an angel of peace in human guise, sent by Pope *Nicholas V.* to preach forgiveness and unity, were of no avail. The extreme Hussites receded daily farther and farther from the Church, and ended by becoming petty sectaries, known as the *Bohemian and Moravian Brethren*,[1] and were persecuted by Calixtines and orthodox Catholics alike. A fresh lease of life was given them by the breaking out of the Reformation in Germany.

§ 281. *German Theology.*

Among those writers who flourished during the present epoch, and were the authors of heretical opinions which exercised a marked influence on their own and succeeding generations of men, and notably on *Luther*, the author of a small *ascetical* work containing fifty-four chapters, holds a distinguished place. From Luther this work received the title of "*German Theology*."[2] Its author lived probably in the fifteenth century, and it is more than likely was a member of the society of mystics known as the *Friends of God*, or Brethren of the Common Life. Having a decided tendency to speculation, and, as his work evinces, possessing a penetrating intellect and a deeply religious mind, he nevertheless frequently loses sight of Christian principles and ideas, indulges in the pantheistic language of *Tauler*, and, if one may judge from numerous utterances of *very doubtful and insidious import*, was in close sympathy with the opinions of *Master Eckhart*.[3] The *idea of God* he makes synonymous with the *idea of goodness*, thus drifting towards *pantheism*. The underlying and pervading idea

[1] Cf. *Bossuet*, Hist. des variations, liv. II., § 168 sq.; *Lochner*, Origin and first destiny of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, Nürnberg, 1832; *Gindely*, Hist. of the Bohemian Brethren (1457-1671), Prague, 1857 sq., 2 vols.

[2] Luther published the *German Theology* in 1516, believing it to be composed of selections from the works of Tauler. In the preface which he wrote for the volume he says: "this admirable little work, though lacking in worldly wisdom and destitute of literary grace, is all the more precious in that it breathes a divine wisdom and exhibits a heavenly art. And if I may be permitted to bring my old fool again into prominence, I will say that I do not hesitate to place beside *the Bible and St. Augustine* a work from which I have learned more concerning God, Christ, man, and in fact everything else, than from any other. Now do I fully comprehend, for the first time, how unjust are the many learned men who reproach us Wittenberg theologians with attempting to put forth something new, as if there did not exist in other times and countries as able men as in our own." There have been many editions of the German Theology in recent times, among which may be mentioned those of *Grell*, Berlin, 1817; *Krüger*, Lemgo, 1822; *Detzer*, Erlangen, 1827; *Troxler*, St. Gall, 1837; *Pfeiffer*, Stuttg., 1851 (from the only *manuscript* known to the present day, of 1497), 2 ed., 1855.

[3] See p. 487, Vol. 2.

of the *German Theology*, brought out in endless variety of expression, resolves itself into the formula: "*God is all in all, and besides Him there is nothing.*" Connected with this idea is the *dualistic* principle that the natural and supernatural elements in man are ceaselessly warring against each other in irreconcilable antagonism. Holding not only that the *finite* is void, a negation, but also that it is *purposeless* and *sinful*, he goes on to infer a *dual being*—that is, one that is or exists, the simple act of being; and a complex state of being in which a *will* is united to the simple act, thus forming the *individual being, which exists for itself.* The first kind of *being*, he says, is essentially *divine*, essentially *good.* To love, to wish, or to desire aught besides God, is, he says, all one with sinning; for as such acts are not *his being, it therefore follows that they are the reverse of good.* Hence the further deduction that personal and free-will must be stifled, and that to wholly renounce one's freedom is the beginning of a Christian life. *To God alone belongs the prerogative of willing and acting, and it is man's duty to remain quiescent and suffer God to will and act through him. In this way will man be "deified."* The better to insure this passive state, he highly recommends abstinence from whatever may stir and rouse into activity the mental energies, such, for instance, as study and the cultivation of science, as understood by the degenerate Schoolmen.[1] He, like other mystical writers, distinguishes *three* stages in the process of "*deification*," viz., purification, illumination, and union with God. The characteristic of the highest stage is a pure and *disinterested love* embracing all things as a unit, that is, "One in all, and all in one." (Ch. 46).

Were the many *characteristic* remarks of this work, which was intended solely *to edify*, and is in several respects very like the *Following of Christ*, taken in connection with the context in which they are found, they would be far less objectionable than they seem when standing isolated.

The work is also much more offensive in the *Latin translation* than in the *original.* It is entirely owing to Luther's misrepresentations of its true drift and meaning that it ever came to be placed on the index of prohibited books.

§ 282. *The Heretics, John Wesel and John van Goch; and the Zealots, John Wessel and Jerome Savonarola.*[2]

I. *John Wesel*, whose family name was Ruchrath or Richrath, but who took his new name from the place of his birth, the Upper-Wesel,

[1] *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 654-666. Against this, **Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. X., pp. 875-884; French transl., Vol. 23, pp. 324-336. *Stoeckl*, Vol. II., pp, 1149-1159. *Reifenrath*, The German Theology of the Frankfort Friend of God, Halle, 1863.

[2] Concerning them, Conf. *Schroeckh*, Christian Ch. Hist., Pt. XXXIII., pp. 278-298, and pp. 543-586. *Muurling*, Comm. de Wessel. Gansf. cum vita tum meritis, etc., Traj., Pars I., 1831; and *Ullmann*, Reformers before the Reformation, especially in Germany and the Netherlands, Hamburg, 1841-42, 2 vols.; the second volume is at the same time

near St. Goar, on the Rhine, was in the early part of his career professor of theology at Erfurt, and afterwards preacher at Mentz and Worms. While at Erfurt he had written a work entitled *Adv. Indulgentias*, in which he renounced the accepted doctrine; and, after receiving his appointment as preacher, again took occasion to assail indulgences, and spread his anti-ecclesiastical and heretical teachings. The universities of Cologne and Heidelberg had rendered judgment unfavourable to his teachings, and he was in consequence, brought before the Inquisition at Mentz (1479), and sentenced to perpetual imprisonment in the Augustinian convent of that city, where he died two years later. He, however, retracted his errors, adding: "I bow to the Holy Catholic Church; I accept the advice of the doctors, and humbly sue for pardon." The following are some of his proscribed propositions: It belongs to Christ alone to expound the Scriptures; all other expositions are faulty and incorrect. The names of the elect of God are written in the Book of Life from all eternity; as no excommunication can erase them, so neither can Pope, bishop, nor indulgences be of any service to these souls in working out their salvation. The commandments of the Church do not bind under sin. Christ may be present in the Eucharist without change of the substance of bread. Peter, said he, did indeed celebrate Mass by command of our Lord, but since his time the liturgy has become so complex and lengthy that it is now a burden to all Christians. I hold, he added, the Pope, the Church, and the councils in the utmost contempt, and do not believe that Christ ever prescribed fasts, pilgrimages, or any prayer other than the Our Father.[1]

II. *John* (Pupper) *van Goch*, a native of the Netherlands, and prior of a nunnery at Malines († 1456), asserted that those doctrines alone were true which were drawn from, and had their warrant in the canonical books of Holy Writ. He said that the purity and truth[2] of Christianity had in every age been disfigured by error—a defect which it was his mission to correct. The Mosaic Law, he added, was the first blot on Christianity, to which succeeded the erroneous doctrine that Christian life consists partially in faith without works. Moreover, Pelagius had eliminated supernatural grace from the Christian scheme, and *vows* had been declared essential to Christian perfection—an error introduced by the Thomists, to which he opposed nine conclusions, favouring a wider freedom in Christian religion.

III. *John Wessel*, whom *Ullmann* has erroneously called the fore-

the second thoroughly revised edition of the work, *John Wessel*, a forerunner of Luther's, Hamburg, 1834.

[1] His work, Adversus indulgentias, and De auctoritate, officio et potestate Pastorum eccl. (*Walch*, Monum. medii ævi, fasc. I. and II.) "Paradoxes of Dr. John of Wesel," in the Fasciculus rerum expetendarum. The acts of his trial, in *Argentré*, Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus ab initio, sæc. XII., T. I., Pt. II., p. 291 sq.

[2] De libertate christ. ed. *C. Grapheus*, Antverp., 1521, 4to; De quatuor erroribus dialogus. (*Walch*, L. c., fasc. IV., p. 73 sq.; Cf. Walchii præf., p. xiii. sq.)

runner of Luther, was born at Groeningen, in 1419. In early life he attended the school of the *Brothers of the Common Life*, at Zwoll, where he was under the influence of Thomas à Kempis. After having acquired here the rudiments of education he went to Cologne, where he studied Greek and Roman classical literature, Hebrew and theology, and after completing his course took a professor's chair. Throwing up his professorship after a time, he visited successively Paris, Italy, and Rome. His admirers, who regarded him as a marvel of humanistic learning and scholastic erudition, and an able advocate of Nominalism, which he had substituted for his earlier Realism, surnamed him the *Light of the World* (*Lux mundi*); while his adversaries, who were at a loss to account for his opposition to many of the current theological views and prevalent vices of the age, called him the *Master of Contradictions* (*Magister Contradictionum*). After making long and laborious journeys in pursuit of knowledge, he returned home, resolved to remain at rest, and devote the remainder of his days to study and literary pursuits, and in preparation for a happy death. He devoted much of his time to prayer and meditation in many of the *monasteries* of Holland, and finally closed his life in 1489.

With regard to the specific doctrines of Luther concerning the fall of man; the denial of free-will; the inability of the Pagans either to know or put in practice Christian truth; justification by faith, denial of papal supremacy, and others, Wessel, instead of being his forerunner, was quite the reverse. *John Faber*, subsequently Bishop of Vienna, had time and again denied (1528) any sympathy between the two, and *Friedrich*, by careful and elaborate investigation of the writings of Wessel,[1] has shown beyond all manner of doubt that they were as far apart in teaching as pole from pole. The stubborn persistence of Protestants in affirming the contrary must be ascribed either to ignorance of his writings or to a wilful perversion of the obvious meaning of his words, and a misapprehension of the opposition which he drew upon himself in the earlier period of his life.[2]

IV. *Jerome Savonarola*, that severe censor of morals, deserves a place here because of his vehement denunciation of *Alexander VI.* Born of a noble family at Ferrara, September 21, 1452, and having completed his philosophical and theological studies, he withdrew from the world, and entered the Dominican Order at Bologna in 1474. He here gave lectures on philosophy, and applied himself to the study of the Fathers, particularly Cassian, Jerome, and Augustine, and of the Holy Scriptures. He commenced his career as a preacher in 1482, and though his first attempts were signal failures, his earnestness and zeal gradually overcame his defects or caused them to be lost sight of, and the success of his subsequent efforts elicited general admiration and applause. When called to Florence to fill the pulpit of St. Mark's, he devoted a portion of his time to the composition of

[1] Cf. against Ullmann's false statements and misrepresentations, the work of *Friedrich*, John Wessel, a life-picture from the Ch. Hist. of the fifteenth century, Ratisb., 1862.

[2] Compl. ed. of his theol. works. or *Farrago Wesseli*, Viteb., 1522, pref. by *Luther*.

a pamphlet "*On the Government of Florence*," which, together with his *apocalyptical* discourses, had the effect of exciting the Florentines to revolt against the Medici, whose representative, Lorenzo the Magnificent, the great preacher is said to have irritated on his death-bed by demanding that the ancient republican constitution of Florence should be restored. Lorenzo was so indignant that he turned his head away, not deigning to give an answer. But Savonarola's most fierce and violent denunciations were hurled against Pope Alexander VI., against bishops and monks, the pagan tendency of the humanists, and the extravagance and refined profligacy everywhere manifest.

He had foretold the expulsion of the Pope and the house of the Medici, and when Charles VIII. of France entered Florence and drove out the merchant princes, his *prophecy* seemed in part to have been verified by the event. The French were shortly compelled to quit the city, and on their departure a republic was proclaimed, of which Savonarola was the leading and guiding genius. It was to be a model Christian commonwealth. A severe censorship was established over morals, sumptuary laws passed, the haunts of vice and dissipation closed, and all sorts of follies repressed. The enthusiasm —an enthusiasm scarcely distinguishable from fanaticism—ran so high that virtuous ladies and notorious courtesans, gay men of the town and grave scholars from the schools and universities, came in one undistinguished troop, and cast articles of dress, gems of art, literary productions, and whatever contributed to luxury or savoured of pagan refinement, into one great pyramid, on the square before St. Mark's, to be there consumed by the flames.

Pope Alexander, after having received many complaints against the preacher, cited him, in the year 1495, to appear at Rome and answer a charge of heresy. Refusing to appear, he was forbidden to preach. He did leave off for a time, and, as *Guicciardini* says, might have hoped to receive papal pardon and absolution within a comparatively short period; but his impetuous temper could ill brook delay, and he again appeared in the pulpit, raging more furiously than ever against the Pope. In the meantime, the republic had become unpopular; *it was found impracticable;* a conspiracy was formed for the restoration of the exiled Medici. This was discovered, and six of the chief conspirators executed; but the execution was itself a violation of Savonarola's own law, and served to hasten his downfall. When political difficulties were thus gathering about him in menacing numbers and importance, a bull arrived from Rome (1497), containing a sentence of excommunication against him and a threat of interdict against the city of Florence, if steps were not taken to restrain his fanatical excesses.

The following year the party of the Medici called the *Arrabiati*, or *Enraged*, came into power. They had a representative in the Franciscan, *Francesco da Puglia* (Francis Apulus), who denounced Savonarola, his political policy, and religious fanaticism. To determine which was right, an appeal was made to divine judgment by

ordeal of fire. This was to decide whether or not the prophecies and acts of Savonarola were really what he represented or others believed them to be. But when the trial was about to come off, the great Dominican and his party threw difficulties in the way, and evaded the test altogether. The revulsion in public feeling was instantaneous and complete. The fickle multitude wished to vent their anger upon their former hero, but being prevented, took their revenge in witty sarcasms and caustic irony. Savonarola was now cast into prison and brought to trial before the new magistrate. The acts of the trial were forwarded to Rome, and on the evidence they afforded he was declared a heretic, a schismatic, and a disturber of the peace. He, with two others of his Order, was given over to the civil power, and on May 23, 1498, the three were executed and their bodies burned.

Savonarola suffered death with courage and fortitude, and his true character is still an unsolved question with many,[1] but his Order has never ceased to cherish his memory with sympathetic affection. Judging, however, from the reliant assurance, the defiant tone, and the daring effrontery pervading all Savonarola's discourses, it would seem that he is not unfairly charged with being a forerunner of Luther; but in all that concerns the essential points of Catholic faith and tradition, there appears no reason to call in question his orthodoxy. In some of his writings—as the "*Triumphus Crucis*" and the *Expositio* Psalmi 31 and 50, the latter of which was also published by Luther—he rivals in their peculiar literature the best mystics of his age. To make Savonarola, therefore, one of a group of reformers of the sixteenth century, as has been done in the monument recently erected to the memory of Luther at Worms, is an obvious falsification of historic truth.[2]

§ 283. *The Inquisition* (*cf.* § 237).

Nic. Eymericus († 1309), Directorium inquisitionis, Barcin., 1503, c. comm. *F. Pegnae*, Rom., 1578; Venet., 1607 f. *Ludovici de Parma*, De origine, officio et progressu officii sanctæ inquisitionis, libb. III., Matrit., 1598; Ant., 1619 f. *Phil. a Limborch*, Historia inquisitionis, Amst., 1692 f. *Reuss*, Collection of the Instructions given to the Spanish Court of Inquisition, transl. from the Spanish into German, with preface, by *Spittler*, Hanover, 1788. *A. Llorente*, Histoire critique de l'inquisition d'Espagne, Par., 1817 sq., 4 vols.; Germ. by *Höck*, Gmünd, 1819 sq., 4 vols. As to the latter, see Tübg. Quart. Rev., 1820-22. This "Critical History of the Inquisition" was translated into French, under the author's eye, by *Alexis Pellier*, Paris, 1817-18, and also into most of the European languages. Prescott, in his Ferdinand and Isabella, III., 467-470; Ranke, in his Fürsten and Völker des südlichen Europas, I., 242, and others, have shown the plainly partisan character of this work, which professes to be founded on authentic documents, but abounds in exaggerations. (Tr.) The biography of Llorente († 1823), by *Pfeilschifter* (in the *Catholic*, Mentz, 1824, Vol. XIII., pp. 1-35), and by *Eckstein* (in the *Catholic*, 1827, Vol. XXIV., pp. 200-210). According to the excellent observations of

[1] His defenders, *J. F. Picus de Mirandula*, Vita Patris Hieronym. Savonar., with documents, ed. *Jac. Quétif* (Dominican), Paris, 1674, 3 T. *Pacif. Burlamacchi*, Vita Savon., ed. *Mansi*, in *Baluzii*, Miscellan., Luc., 1761 f., T. I., and the modern Protestant biographies. See p. 71, n. 1. *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. IX., pp. 638-648; French transl., Vol. 21, pp. 239-250.

[2] Cf. The Luther Monument of Worms, in the light of truth, 2 ed., Mentz, 1869.

Baron Eckstein, Llorente was a Jansenist in religion and a utilitarian in politics. Cf. *de Maistre*, Lettres à un gentilhomme Russe sur l'inquisition espagnole; German, Mentz, 1836. **Hefele*, Cardinal Ximenes, ch. 18. (The Spanish Inquisition and the questionable authority of Llorente). TR. ADD: *J. Balmes*, Catholicism and Protestantism compared in relation to Civilisation.

Innocent III., because he ordered heretics to be looked after in Southern France, and to be either instructed and brought back to the Church, or, if obstinate, prevented from doing harm by consigning them to perpetual imprisonment, has been generally credited as the author of the *Inquisition*. This, however, is far from correct. Previously to the time of Innocent III., the *Eleventh Œcumenical* or *Third Council of Lateran*, held in 1179, had published a decree declaring that, "though the Church thirsts not for blood (*ecclesia non sitit sanguinem*), a fear of corporal punishment is nevertheless frequently salutary to the soul of man, and that therefore such heretics and their abettors as would not be content to act silently and in private, but *boldly* insisted on preaching their errors *publicly*, thus *perverting* weak and silly people and inflicting *cruelties* upon the faithful, sparing neither churches, widows, nor orphans, should be denied all intercourse with the orthodox, and that an indulgence of two years should be granted those who would wage war against them." The *Council of Verona* (1184), presided over by Pope Lucius III., and at which the Emperor *Frederic I.* was present, in compliance with the above decree, directed the bishops "to inform themselves, either personally or through their representatives, concerning persons on whom either popular rumour or private denunciation had affixed the suspicion of heresy; and in dealing with them to make a distinction between the suspected, the convicted, the repentant, and the relapsed, apportioning a proper punishment to each; and, finally, after prescribing spiritual punishment, to hand them over to the *civil* authority." Such was the real and true origin of the Inquisition. It was not till much later, when heretical fanaticism, spurning all overtures of the Holy See, and exciting public indignation by the cruel assassination of *Peter of Castelnau*, that Pope Innocent III. resolved upon vigorous measures for its suppression; not, as has been asserted, to give a sanction to tyrannous and arbitrary measures, but in some sort unwillingly, fearing, in his paternal solicitude, that the good grain might be plucked with the tares, that some might manifest a stubborn spirit, and the weak be driven into heresy. The *Twelfth Œcumenical*, or *Fourth Council of Lateran* (1215), gave the following instructions to inquisitors: "The accused shall be informed as to the charges preferred against him, that an opportunity may be given him of defending himself. His accusers shall be made known to him, and he himself shall have a hearing before his judges. Bishops shall either personally or through their representatives, make the circuit of their dioceses twice yearly, if possible, but once certainly; they shall appoint two or three laymen of integrity, who shall be bound by oath to seek out heretics; they

may also commit this office to the whole people of a district (*inquisitores inquisitio*), who shall also be bound by oath to look up and denounce heretics." In the *Council of Toulouse*, held in 1229, during the pontificate of *Gregory IX.*, the *Episcopal Inquisition* was formally established and received definite organisation. Its courts were raised to the dignity of regular tribunals, the methods and duties of which were laid down in an instrument embracing fifteen chapters.[1] Lest bishops might be tempted to spare their friends, Gregory IX. sent foreign monks, chiefly *Dominicans*, to perform the duties of inquisitors (1232).

The inquisition thus established was no longer, as formerly, a local tribunal, but one having general jurisdiction. Besides the reasons already given[2] for the severity exercised towards heretics, it

[1] The following are the principal instructions given to *inquisitores hereticæ pravitatis:*

The first chapter commands that every archbishop and bishop shall appoint, in each parish, a priest and two or three laymen of piety and good repute, who shall bind themselves, under oath, to search out diligently heretics, their aiders, concealers, and protectors, and make them known to the bishop, the lord of the manor, or their officials.

Chapters second and third make the same provision for the districts of exempted abbots and temporal princes.

Chapter fourth ordains that anyone who knowingly conceals a heretic shall be delivered up for punishment and have his lands confiscated.

Chapters fifth and sixth provide that any landed proprietor on whose estates heretics have been discovered shall suffer the legal punishment of said neglect, and that the house in which the heretic has been found shall be destroyed and the estate confiscated.

Chapter seventh decrees that any remissness on the part of officials in the prosecution of heretics shall be punished with loss of office and confiscation of property.

Chapter eighth provides that, in order to avoid the consequences of unjust or slanderous accusations, the arraigned shall not suffer punishment until he has been examined by either the bishop or his appointed delegate, and declared to be guilty of heresy.

Chapter tenth ordains that those who have abjured heresy shall be removed into an uninfected district, be intrusted with no public charge, and wear upon their dress two coloured crosses until absolved by either the Pope or his legate.

Chapter eleventh prescribes that if the conversion of a heretic has been effected through fear, he shall be kept under arrest, to prevent his perverting others, and the expenses of his imprisonment be defrayed by himself, if in good circumstances, but if poor, by the bishop.

Chapter twelfth ordains that males over fourteen and females over twelve years of age shall abjure heresy, and anyone refusing to do so shall be treated as one suspected of heresy.

Chapter thirteenth orders that those who do not go to confession and communion *three times a year*—viz., at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost—unless excused by their confessors, shall be held suspected of heresy.

Chapter fifteenth forbids anyone either suspected or convicted of heresy to practise medicine. This was intended to guard against the frightful crimes such persons were suspected of committing, known as the "*endura.*" (*Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 194 sq.; *Harduin*, T. VII., p. 176).

Speaking of these provisions, the writer of an able series of articles on the Inquisition, in the *Dublin Review* for 1867, remarks: "These are the laws for the establishment of the Inquisition, and the rules which were given for its guidance: and when we take in view the frightful evils they were intended to counteract, and the state of Europe, then entirely destitute of a preventive and detective police, we must admit that they were far from being too severe. The rigour with which they were executed undoubtedly prevented a renewal of hostilities in the south of France; and the fact that the Manichæn heresy succumbed before them is a proof that they were wisely adapted to the age in which they were enacted." (Tr.)

[2] Page 480, Vol. 2

may be added that sectaries like the Cathari, Waldenses, and Albigenses were equally dangerous to Church and State, and by boldly and defiantly attacking the universal belief of the *One*, True, and Only saving Church, excited the alarm of both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and drew upon themselves penalties of various degrees, not excluding perpetual imprisonment, tortures, and death. It is doubtful if *in our own day* sectaries as dangerous and malignant as the Albigenses and Cathari would be treated more leniently; and if so, why should we marvel at their treatment in the Middle Ages, *so eminently religious* in character, where public opinion breathed the very spirit of our Lord's admonition: "Fear not those that kill the body, and cannot kill the soul, but rather fear him that can destroy both soul and body in hell;"[1] when Church and State were so intimately united; and when *heresy* was associated in the public mind as a crime equally offensive and dangerous to both, and apostasy from the faith, an evil more heinous and not less menacing to social order than larceny and murder.[2] Hence, once a person indicted for heresy had been found guilty, he was handed over to the *civil* authority for punishment, with the however invariable prayer that "*he might be spared, and not condemned to death.*" As has already been observed, princes of very different character, like the Emperor *Frederic II.*, *Raymond VII.*, Count of Toulouse, and Louis IX., King of France, enforced the inquisitorial laws with extreme severity, enjoining their faithful execution upon the magistracy.[3]

It is to be noted that the Inquisition was at first nowhere established as a *permanent* tribunal, such as it became later on in Spain. *Gregory IX.* (1237-1241) and *Innocent IV.* confined its jurisdiction within narrow limits in Southern France, and *Boniface VIII.* (1298) and *Clement V.* (1305) considerably modified the rigour of its rules. After these changes had been made, and partly in consequence of

[1] Matt. x., 28.

[2] This is precisely the sense in which *Honorius III.* wrote to Louis VIII., King of France, concerning the Albigenses: "Since it is the duty of the civil power to bring brigands and thieves to justice, how can you, who are intrusted with the welfare of the whole State, neglect to rid your kingdom of heretics, *who plunder and drag to perdition souls so much more precious than earthly treasures?*" The same language is employed by Innocent III.: "Cum enim secundum legitimas sanctiones *reis læsæ majestatis* punitis capite bona confiscentur eorum, quanto magis qui aberrantes in fide Domini Dei filium offendunt, a capite nostro, quod est Christus, ecclesiastica debent restrictione præcidi et bonis temporalibus spoliari, *cum longe sit gravius æternam, quam temporalem lædere majestatem.*—Damnati vero præsentibus sæcularibus potestatibus aut eorum ballivis relinquantur animadversione debita puniendi." It is worthy of note that many secular princes held the same ideas. As to *Frederic II.* (*Petri de Vineis*, epp. I., 25-27; *Goldasti*, Constitut. Imper., T. I., p. 295); concerning *Louis IX.*, King of France (*Laurière*, Ordinances des rois de France, Paris, 1723, T. I., p. 50 sq.); on *Raymund VII.* of Toulouse (Statuta Raymundi super hæresi Albigensi an. 1233, in *Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 265 sq.) *Wladislaus Jagello*, King of Poland, also confirms the laws against the heretics, in the year 1424. See *Januszawski*, Statuta prawa, etc., Krak., 1600, fol. 260-268.

[3] "We should bear in mind," says the Protestant, *Bluhme*, "that these things happened under an emperor (Frederic II.), who had made himself odious to the Catholic Church, and that the worst horrors of the Inquisition were first perpetrated after it had passed into the hands of the Spanish kings." (System of Canon Law, Bonn, 1858, p. 49).

them, the Inquisition was established in the whole of France, in Italy, Germany, and Poland, and by act of parliament in England (1400). One cannot help deploring the fate of those heretics who, like the "*witches*" of a later day, expiated their offences by the penalty of death, and regretting with *St. Augustine* that efficient and progressive disciplinary enactments, sufficiently severe, but stopping short of extreme punishment, had not been employed to reclaim them from their error and bring them back to the Church; but still we cannot agree with *Protestants* in condemning the Inquisition and its methods of dealing with heresy, as inducing mental servitude and affording a pretext and a means of taking a bloody revenge. To be just to the Middle Ages, they should be judged *by the principles and ideas of those times*, and not of our own. Let anyone wishing to get a definite notion of the legislation then in force against heretics, look into the *Mirror of Suabia and Saxony*, or the code of *Frederic II.*, the Hohenstaufen, or the still more modern Code of *Charles V.* (1532).[1] Protestants, boasting of superior mental freedom, have affected to ignore the weight of reason based upon contemporaneous circumstances; and while arraigning Catholics, have passed in silence over the policy of *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, *Calvin*, and *Beza*. Did not these men support by arguments at once solid and decisive the lawfulness of coercive measures against heretics? Did they not prove the sincerity of their convictions by applauding in practice what they advocated in theory? Did they not make a signal and terrible application of their principles to a vast number of persons?[2] Did they not punish witchcraft and sorcery as capital crimes, at the very moment when Catholics—like *Cornelius Loos*, at Mentz († 1598), and, still later, the Jesuits *Adam Tanner* († 1632), and particularly *Frederic von Spee* († 1635)—were earnestly protesting against the policy as absurd; and when *Catholic* sovereigns, at the request of Catholic priests, were abolishing these tribunals? (Vide infra, § 377).

Although it is notorious that the *Spanish Inquisition* was wholly different in character and aim from that established by the *Holy See*, strenuous and numerous efforts have been made to identify the two for the sole purpose of aspersing the Catholic Church. After the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon had been united into one by the marriage of

[1] Cf. *Hefele*, Hist. of Conc. of Councils, Vol. VII., Pt. I., p. 214 sq.

[2] To instance a few—*Felix Mans*, the Anabaptist, was drowned at the instigation of Zwinglius (qui mergunt mergantur); *Servetus* was burned by the advice of Calvin, because he held heretical doctrines on the Trinity; *Gentilis* was beheaded; *Sylvanus* of *Ladenburg* was put to the sword in the market-place of Heidelberg; Chancellor *Crell*, after suffering inhuman torture to the demoniacal amusement of his persecutors, was finally beheaded for having embraced Calvinism; *Henning Brabant*, after having been frightfully mutilated, was executed because of his pretended familiarity with the devil (see § 337); *Carlstadt* and *Hesshusius* were cruelly persecuted; *Kepler*, the celebrated astronomer, provoked, by his scientific teachings, the wrath of the Reformers; and last, but not least, were the victims of the *Star Chamber*, in England. In the small district of *Nürnberg* alone, between the years 1577 and 1617, three hundred and fifty-six persons suspected of heresy and witchcraft were executed, and three hundred and forty-five flogged or mutilated. (See *Besnard's* Repertory, 1842, p. 301). *Melanchthon's* opinion of the capital punishment pronounced against heretics by Calvin is given below, § 321, note.

Isabella and *Ferdinand* the Catholic (1479), no efforts were spared to consolidate the new monarchy, increase its power, and curb the overbearing insolence of the nobility. To secure these ends, and fill the depleted exchequer by fines and confiscations, the two sovereigns determined to establish the Inquisition, whose special office, from the year 1484, was to oppress the *Moors* and *Jews*, two numerous, wealthy, and influential classes, the implacable enemies of Catholic Spain.[1] From this time forth the Inquisition became a *national* institution in Spain, and not only the lower and illiterate classes, but the nobility, men and women, might be seen in crowds at the *Autos da Fé* (*actus fidei*), the scenes, not only of bloody executions, but of solemn retractions. Those who abjured their errors were immediately granted their freedom.[2] The sword and olive branch on the armorial bearing

[1] The author of the articles in the *Dublin Review*, already referred to, after giving the history of the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition, confirms the statement of the text. "Ferdinand, however," says he, "had fully determined not to have any purely ecclesiastical institution retarded in its action by over-merciful papal restrictions, but that the inquisitors should be royal officers, paid by and subservient to the Crown, whose duty should be strictly confined to determining whether prisoners brought before them were guilty of Judaism or not; and the Pope had been grossly deceived with regard to the formidable position the king intended it should occupy towards his rebellious subjects." (*Hefele*, Life of Card. Ximenes, p. 265). And again: "Ferdinand had so contrived that the duty, which the Church was bound to perform, and which the Pope could neither refuse nor evade, of declaring where errors in faith existed, should be made subservient to the State purpose of detecting high treason, then identical with Judaism; whilst the Church itself could exercise no controlling influence whatsoever to stay the terrible retributions awarded by the criminal courts of the realm. From that time, therefore, we find Church and State, as hostile elements, combined in accomplishing the same purpose; ecclesiastical royal functionaries designating the multitudes of Judaizing Christians who were destroying the kingdom, yet vainly struggling against the harshness with which an exaggerated instinct of self-preservation led the government, supported by popular feeling throughout all Spain, to sacrifice the object of its dread. Many Judaizers fled the country, and convincing evidence of the well-known merciful disposition of the Holy See is afforded by the fact that numbers bent their course towards Rome, and appealed to the Sovereign Pontiff for protection against the cruelty of their king. (*a*) The indignation of Sixtus IV. knew no bounds when he became aware to what extent he had been trifled with, and that his intention to serve the Spanish monarchs, by converting and preserving their heretical subjects, was defeated by the rigorous measures employed. On the 29th of January, 1482, only one year after the establishment of the Inquisition at Seville, he issued a brief to Ferdinand and Isabella, vehemently complaining that he had been defrauded into the publication of the bull confirming the royal plan for such a tribunal; that the intentions of those sovereigns had been wholly misrepresented to him, and that their new institution was in direct opposition to every court of the kind elsewhere, and contrary to the decrees of his predecessors. He rejects the petition of Isabella to introduce tribunals similar to that at Seville into the other Spanish provinces, for the reason that they already possessed them according to the ancient ecclesiastical and episcopal form. He reproves the inquisitors themselves, in the severest language, for their harsh and unpriestly conduct, accuses them of having punished persons who were not even heretics, and declares that he is only withheld from deposing them from their office by regard for the two monarchs. He orders that, for the future, they shall not proceed against heretics at all, except with the concurrence of the respective Castilian bishops. (*b*).

[2] As to Llorente's assertions, cf. *Hefele*, L. c., p. 340 sq.

(*a*). *Prescott*, T. I., p. 254; *Balmes*, pp. 207, 208. At a later period, an *auto-da-fe* was held at Rome in regard to two hundred and fifty Spaniards who had appealed to the Pope. They were all reconciled to the Church, and *not one* was condemned to death.

(*b*). The Papal brief is contained in *Llorente*, T. IV., p. 345. "It was," says *Ranke* (Fursten und Volker, Vol. I., p. 242), "above all things, in its spirit and object, a political institute." "The Inquisition," says *Guizot* (Cours d'histoire moderne V., lec. II.), "was, at first, more political than religious, and destined rather for the maintenance of order than the defence of faith." (Tr.)

of the Inquisition had a deep significance. Neither atheists nor infidels, however, were persecuted in Spain, unless when they attempted to proselytize. The "Holy Office" of Spain was, therefore, a *purely political institution*, against which Popes sometimes exerted their full influence and power.[1] If the Government condescended to appoint churchmen to some of its offices, it did so of its own accord, and their presence not unfrequently softened to clemency the rigour of this terrible tribunal. Such was the influence of *Thomas Torquemada* (1483-1498) and *Diego Deza* (1499-1506), both of whom held the office of Grand Inquisitor. It almost freezes the blood in one's veins to be *informed* that in the interval of three hundred years, three hundred and forty-one thousand, or eleven hundred and thirty-six annually, were condemned to capital punishment by the Spanish Inquisition.

But as the English historian, *Gibbon*, remarks, and *De Maistre* reaffirms, even admitting the accuracy of the figures, when compared with the thousands slaughtered in the bloody conflicts occasioned throughout Europe by the introduction of Protestantism, the advantage is on the side of Spain.

CHAPTER III.

ECCLESIASTICAL SCIENCE.

§ 284. *Scholasticism during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.*

Bossuet-Cramer, Pt. VII., p. 791 sq. *Schröckh*, Ch. Hist., Vol. XXXIV. *Tiedemann*, Genius of Speculative Philosophy, Vol. V., p. 125 sq. *Mattes*, Art. "Scholasticism," in Vol. IX. of the *Freiburg* Cyclopæd.; French transl., art. "Scholastique," Vol. 21, pp. 328-398. End of the art. "*Schoolmen*," in *Blunt's* Dict. of Sects, etc. *Ritter*, Hist. of Christian Philosophy, Vol. IV. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 952 sq. *Ueberweg*, Hist. of Philosophy during the age of the Fathers and Schoolmen, p. 210 sq. The works on the Hist. of Christian Literature in general, by *du Pin*, *Ceillier*, *Oudinus*, *Cave*, *Busse*, &c.

THE two leading questions that agitated the Schoolmen during these centuries and held the most prominent place in ecclesiastical science, were the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and chiefly the controversy on *Nominalism* and *Realism*. Nominalism and Realism had now become so extreme in their assertions and claims, that while the latter degenerated into a sensuous materialism, the former issued in a mystical idealism, represented by the mystics of these two centuries. Attention was directed principally to philosophical questions,

[1] Cf. *Adolph Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. IV., p. 197.

introductory to theological studies, and much time and energy were wasted in discussing useless subtleties and refinements of thought.

At the opening epoch, *Durandus of Saint-Pourçain*, a Dominican friar, and, after the year 1313, a lecturer in Paris,[1] where he was called the *Resolute Doctor* (*Doctor resolutissimus*), and who subsequently became Bishop of Meaux († 1333), acquired prominence by his advocacy of Nominalism. According to him, *whatever has not determinate notes may indeed be an object of thought, but cannot be said to enjoy true being.* In his principal work on the Sentences of the Lombard, he assails the extreme advocacy of the principles of Aristotle, then so universally accepted.

William of Ockham in Surrey, a pupil of Duns Scotus, a Franciscan friar, a professor of theology in Paris, then provincial of his Order in England, the *Carus Magister* of Luther and the *Deliciæ quondam* of Melanchthon, excelled all the schoolmen in wit, severity of reasoning, and rigid intellectual discipline. In the quarrel between the Pope and the Emperor Louis of Bavaria he employed his powerful pen in the cause of the latter, and boldly attacked the teachings of his master, Duns Scotus. He was surnamed the *Singular* and the *Invincible Doctor*, and the *Venerable Beginner* (*Doctor singularis et invincibilis*, and *Venerabilis inceptor*). He revived Nominalism, which had lain dormant since the days of Roscelin and Abelard, and pursued it to its last consequences. Starting with the principle, *omnis res positiva extra animum eo ipso est singularis*, he characterized universals as *fictio quædam*, creations of the fancy wholly destitute of reality. He consistently limited all human knowledge to that which is acquired through the medium of the senses by the observation of individual objects, and denied that any reliance could be placed on whatever transcended these limits, thus basing himself squarely upon the *principles of scepticism.* The conflicting views concerning the reality and non-reality of ideas marked in this age the precise relations of science to faith—a circumstance which contributed to make the controversies between the Nominalists (now called *Ockhamites*) and Realists more animated and earnest. The University of Paris was the great battle-field of the two parties. It was here that *John Buridan*, who had held professorships in philosophy and theology[2] until 1358, first proclaimed himself an Ockhamite, and defended Nominalism after it had been condemned by the Faculty of Arts, in the years 1339 and 1340. Nominalism, by the accession of *Peter d'Ailly*, who became Chancellor of the University in 1389, was completely victorious. It was ably advocated in Germany by *Gabriel Biel* of Tübingen; and no less ably opposed by the University of Prague, founded in 1347.

[1] His principal theological work, Quæstiones super IV., lib. Sententiar., Lugd., 1495 f., which edition also contains his Centiloquium theologicum, theologiam speculativam sub centum conclusionibus complectens. His writings for the Emperor Louis, see in *Goldasti*, Monarch, T. I. and II.

[2] Opera ed. Oxon., 1637, 1640. *Bulæus*, Hist. Univers. Paris, T. IV., p. 257 sq. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 973 sq.

As *Gerson* had already reconciled the antagonistic claims of Scholasticism and Mysticism, he now sought to effect a compromise between Nominalism and Realism. Admitting with the Nominalists that individual objects are not contained *formaliter* in God, he also held with the Realists that they are contained in Him in a sense higher than *virtualiter;* and, in opposition to both, maintained that "*rationes creatuarum* SUPEREMINENTER *sunt in Deo.*" According to this theory everything has a dual being (*ens duplex*)—one by which it is what it is (*natura rei in seipsa*) and the other by which it is what the intellect apprehends it to be (*esse objectale seu repræsentativum in ordine ad intellectum creatum vel increatum*); and hence, he said, all knowledge which does not include these two phases of being is necessarily defective; and to fancy that an apprehension of the *subjective* being or that which exists only in the mind, includes a knowledge of the *objective* or that which is the thing itself, is a delusion not far removed from insanity.[1]

Thomas Bradwardinus,[2] successively professor of theology at the University of Oxford and Archbishop of Canterbury († 1349) surnamed the *Profound* (*Doctor profundus*), and *Thomas of Strasburg* († 1357), both entered the lists against Nominalism; but the efficiency of the former was considerably lessened by his advocacy of a modified predestination, so detrimental to progress in spiritual life and well-nigh fatal to every generous Christian impulse.

Raymond of Sabunde,[3] who, after having been in early life a physician and jurist, entered the priesthood and became a professor of theology at Toulouse (c. 1436), ably defended Realism in his work entitled "*Theologia naturalis*," in which he followed the method of Alanus. His exertions were directed towards popularizing Scholasticism with a special view to benefiting the infidels of his own country. He did indeed place revealed truth on a level with the teachings of reason, but with no intention of giving equal authority to each; for he says expressly, "God has given both creatures and his own word to man for his comfort, *but God's word must always be of paramount authority.*" The ethical principle was the basis of his system, and he accordingly developed the argument drawn from the moral governance of the world for proving the existence of God, better than did Abelard in a former, or Kant in a succeeding age.

[1] Subtilitas metaphysicantium si quærit reperire in rebus ipsis secundum suum esse reale tale esse, quale habent in suo esse objectali, jam non est subtilitas sed stoliditas et vera insania. (de concord. metaphys. cum log.) Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. IX., pp. 748, 749; French transl., Vol. 21, p. 383.

[2] De causa adv. Pelag. lib. III., ed. *Savilius*, Lond., 1618. *Lechler*, De Thoma Bradwardino, Lips., 1862.

[3] *Raymund de Sab.*, Lib. creaturar. s. theol. natur., whereof Viola animæ s. de natura hominis is an epitome, Argent., 1496. Latiniore stylo in comp. redact. a. *J. Comenio*, Amst., 1659; Solisb., 1852. *Holberg*, De theol. naturali Raymundi de Sabunde comm., Hall, 1843. *Matzke*, The Natural Theology of Raymond of Sabunde, Breslau, 1846. *F. Nitzsch*, Quæstione Raimundianæ (Periodical of Historical Theology, 1859, nro. 3). †*Huttler*, The Religious Philosophy of Raymond of Sabunde, Augsb., 1851. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., pp. 1035-78 *Freiburg* Cyclopædia, Vol. IX., p. 497 sq.; French trans., art. *Sébonde*, Vol 21, p. 438 sq.

Among the commentators on Peter Lombard during this epoch may be classed *Peter d'Ailly* († 1425);[1] *Gabriel Biel*[2] of Tübingen, who, like Nicholas of Cusa, had received his scientific training from the Clercs Regular; and, finally, *Paul Cortesius*, whose commentaries have the merit of being written in the elegant Latinity of the classic age.

Most of these writers, while loyally attached to the dogmatic teachings of the Church, are deplorably deficient in the warmth of Christian feeling indicative of the presence and true appreciation of Catholic faith. This is especially conspicuous in the writings of *Pomponatius*, who held that *a principle may be true in philosophy, yet false in theology*.[3] A position so anomalous stripped *Scholasticism* of its original character and tendency, and contributed not a little to alienate religiously-minded men from it. A contemporary has left the following picture of its condition at this time. "Scholastic theology," says he, "after having rendered important service in controversies with infidels, and done much to train the mental faculties and sober the judgment, has gradually drifted into a condition of utter uselessness. The new sophists have made a shameless traffic of the word of God and transformed a worthy science into a confused mesh of words. They discuss questions the most futile, deal blows in the air, distort Holy Scripture, and draw upon our holy faith the laughter and ridicule of the world. Even St. Thomas long ago protested against this folly."[4] To correct a tendency so mischievous and degrading, men holding and advocating very different principles came forward, and, basing their claims upon the simple and positive teachings of faith and Holy Writ, put forth their best energies in giving a more practical direction to the one-sided and barren labours of dialecticians. To those who have been frequently mentioned as the true reformers of that age is due also the credit of this movement.

Nicholas de Clemenge, who, after having been successively Rector of the University of Paris and private secretary to Benedict XIII., withdrew from the world to lead a solitary life, and died about the year 1440, criticised unsparingly those who engaged in intellectual pursuits and assumed the teaching office with the sole view of making money. It is the privilege of man, he said, to give a noble and disinterested direction to his mental powers; and to enter upon the study of theology is legitimate only when one's motives are pure and spring from a source higher than that of sordid gain.[5] It is because a rule

[1] Commentarii in IV. lib. Sententiar. et Tractatus, ed. Argentinæ, 1490 f., Par. 1500, 4to. The Vita Petri de Alliaco, in *v. d. Hardt*, L. c., T. I., P. VIII., pp. 449-487.

[2] Collectorium ex Occamo in IV. lib. Sentent. (Tüb., 1502, 2 T.), Brix., 1574, 4 T., 4to. Serm. de tempore, Tüb., 1500, 4to. Conf. *Trithem.*, De scriptor. eccl. c. 903, and *Linsenmann*, Gabr. Biel, the last of the Schoolmen, and Nominalism (Tübg. Quart. 1865, nro. 3, p. 449 sq.) The *same*, Rise of the University of Tübingen, ibid., p. 195 sq.

[3] Condemned by the Fifth Lateran Council, Sess. VIII.

[4] *Henricus Cornelius Agrippa*, De vanitate scientiarum, lib. I., c. 97.

[5] *Nicol. de Clemangis*, De studio theol. (*d'Achéry*, Spicileg., T. I., pp. 473-480); his Life, by *v. d. Hardt*, T. I., Pt. II., p. 71; his reformatory writings, ed. *Lydius*, Lugd. Batav., 1613, 4to, and in *v. d. Hardt*.

of conduct so ennobling is lost sight of that, though doctors of divinity are daily increasing in numbers, there is no perceptible diminution of evil. Moreover, it is but a sterile work to correct intellectual errors when the heart is allowed to riot in vice, and but a cold consolation to know that the clergy are highly cultivated, when the bulk of the people are sunk in error and sin.

Nicholas of Cusa was equally emphatic in denouncing the theological tendency of this epoch.[1]

Finally, Chancellor *Gerson*[2] also exerted himself to introduce a better spirit among theologians. He called their attention to the works of St. Bonaventure, and recommended for their special study his *Breviloquium* and *Itinerarium mentis ad Deum*, as excellent compendiums of theology. He had also recourse to other expedients to effect a reformation in ecclesiastical studies, and does not seem to have shared the opinions of those who decried *science* as an instrument of good in the amelioration of the world.

§ 285. *Mysticism—The Friends of God.*

The works on Christian Mysticism, by *Görres, Helfferich, Noak*, see above, p. 525. Vol. 2. *Görres*, Introduction to the Life and Writings of *Henry Suso*, by *Diepenbrock*, pp. xxv.-cxxxvi. *Greith*, German Mysticism among the Friars Preachers (from 1255-1350), Freiburg, 1861. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., p. 1096 sq. *Galle*, Spiritual Voices from the Middle Ages, Halle, 1841. *Ch. Schmidt*, Les Mystiques du quatorzième siècle, Strasb., 1836. The *same*, Etudes sur le Mysticisme allem., in Mem. de l'Acad. des Sciences mor. et pol., Paris, 1847. *Pfeiffer*, The German Mystics of the fourteenth century, Lps., 1845, sq. *Böhringer*, Ch. Hist. in Biographies, Vol. II., Pt. III. **Lasson* in *Ueberweg's* Hist. of Philos., § 36, pp. 217-235. Tr. add: *Hamberger*, Voices from the Sanctuary of Christian Mysticism, Stuttg., 1657. *Preger*, Preparatory Studies for the Hist. of Germ. Mystic. (in the Journal of Hist. Theol., 1869.)

The writers on Mysticism, like the theologians referred to above, aimed at turning Scholasticism to practical account, and rousing religious life into activity and earnestness. In proportion as Scholasticism became barren and fruitless, Mysticism gained strength, energy, and sobriety. The mystics, though leading a contemplative life, were far from entirely relinquishing the world; on the contrary, they did their best to influence it by their teachings, their zeal, and the light of their example, and to impart to it *the peace* and joy they themselves experienced. With this aim they combined in mystical brotherhoods, called themselves the *Friends of God*, and, making their appearance first on the banks of Lower Rhine, spread thence southward to Cologne and Strasburg, and into Franconia, Suabia, Bavaria, and Switzerland, as far as the confines of Upper Italy.[3] If an effort had been made at this time to restrain their zeal within due bounds, it might have taken

[1] *Nic. Cusanus*, De docta ignorantia (Opp. Basil., 1565, f.) This title was given by the author to his principal work, because he was of opinion that a perfect knowledge of the Trinity was unattainable.

[2] *J. Gerson*, Epp. duo de reform. theol. (Opp., ed. *du Pin*, T. I., pp. 120-124.) Concerning Bonaventura, he declares: Bonaventuræ opuscula duo; *Breviloquium* et *Itinerarium* tanta sunt arte compendii divinitus composita, ut supra ipsa nihil.

[3] *Schmidt*, The Friends of God in the fourteenth century, Jena, 1854 (Vol. V. of the Strasb. Supplem.)

a more noble and useful direction. Vigorously assailing such as offered them any resistance, they necessarily provoked opposition, and gave the first impulse to a reaction. Their advocacy of *extreme Realism* led them straight to *Pantheism*, and gave rise to their favourite term "*deification*" (*Vergotten*). These pantheistic teachings were drawn chiefly from the writings of *Master Eckhart*,[1] who, in the beginning of the present epoch (1304-1329), had, with considerable originality and boldness of thought, thrown the peculiar features of Mysticism into *scientific* form. Modern criticism has discovered in his writings many mischievous errors and not a few exalted and pregnant truths.[2] Although his teaching was pantheistic in tendency, his object was to show that one may approach near to God, and become, in some sort, like Him, by leading a holy life; and that the more perfect the likeness grows in him, the less is there of the creature and the more of God. "Why," asks Eckhart, "is God become man?" And he answers: "That I may be born of the same God. For this did God die, that I might die to the world and to creatures."[3]

The sweet, the amiable, and the profound *John Tauler* (*Doctor Sublimis et Illuminatus*, † 1361) sympathized with the Mystics, and shared their sentiments. He was a member of the Order of St. Dominic, at Strasburg; had been a student of the writings of Eckhart, and about the year 1340 fell under the influence of *Nicholas of Basle*, Eckhart's disciple. He was an indefatigable preacher, and everywhere and at all times exhorted his hearers to become estranged from the world, to keep a guard upon their senses, to freely take upon them the yoke of Christ, to renounce their self-will, and "*to imitate Christ in holy poverty*," that thus they might become like unto God. But, though meek and humble, he boldly withstood the abuse of *interdict*, and, when the "*Black Death*" was desolating Strasburg, went through the city, from house to house, administering the Sacraments to the sick and dying, and giving consolation to all. This spirit of resistance, his boldness in attempting to reach out beyond the bounds placed by God to human knowledge, and his maintenance of propositions closely allied to Pantheism, drew upon him and his adherents a momentary chastisement.[4]

Henry Suso (*Amandus*) was born at Uberlingen, on the shores of the Lake of Constance, March 21, 1300. He was educated by the Dominicans

[1] See p. 487, Vol. 1.

[2] Cf. *Lasson*, Master Eckhart, Berlin, 1868. The *same*, in *Ueberweg*, p. 219 sq., where also is given a copious bibliography concerning him.

[3] *Gieseler's* Compend. Eccl. Hist. IV. 176, Clarke's transl. (Tr.)

[4] *Oberlini*, Dissert. de J. Tauleri dictione vernacula et myst., Argentorati, 1786, 4to. Opp. latine reddidit *Surius*, Colon., 1548.—Imitation of the "Indigent Life" of Christ; the best edition of it is that of *Schlosser*, Frcft. on the Main, 1833, cum lexic. Tauleriano. His sermons were published in the same place, in 3 vols., 1826. The history of his own conversion, related by himself, is prefixed to the "Life of Christ." Cf. *C. Schmidt*, John Tauler of Strasburg. Essay on the history of the mysticism and spiritual life of the fourteenth century, Hamburg, 1841. *Bæhring*, John Tauler and the Friends of God, Hambg., 1853; *Bæhmer*, Nicholas of Basle, and Tauler (Giesebrecht's Damaris, 1865, p. 148 sq.) Cf. Freiburg Theological Review, Vol. IX., p. 268 sq. *Stöckl*, Vol. II., pp. 1120-28.

at Constance and Cologne,[1] into whose hands he was given at the age of twelve, and was regarded as one of the most distinguished ascetics of the Middle Ages. He died at Ulm, in 1365. Less philosophical than Eckhart, and less practical than Tauler, he was more enthusiastical and *poetical* than either in his adoration of the Eternal Wisdom. He was, however, by no means destitute of a spirit of practical piety, and was ever ready to interrupt his contemplation to defend the weak against the strong. His curious work, entitled "*The Nine Rocks,*" was unquestionably called forth by the vices of the age, and a fear lest the anger of heaven might overtake the wicked. This mystic appeals in his writings to all classes of society. Although belonging strictly to no particular school of thought, and having no consistent system, his efforts being chiefly confined to whimsical applications of the mystical theology of the preceding age, yet his underlying principle and motive were contained in the formula: "Man should completely divest himself of carnal nature by imitating Christ's sufferings, and, thus transformed, sink into the depths of the Divine Essence." To arrive at this state, three stages were to be passed through: first, purification, or the deadening of carnal desire; second, illumination, or the filling of the soul with forms of divine truth; third, perfection, or the fullest enjoyment of heavenly bliss. That he strove earnestly to realize in himself what he preached to others is abundantly shown in his *autobiography*.[2]

John Ruysbroch (*Doctor Ecstaticus*, † 1381), prior of the canons regular of Grünthal, near Brussels, also advocated three stages in spiritual life,[3] in the last of which one lives entirely in the love of God, and is so completely united to Him that he is dead to all objects of sense. Ruysbroch, while claiming to write under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, makes use of expressions which would seem to indicate that one, while enjoying that close union, loses his personality, and, as a consequence, is absorbed in the Divine Essence. *St.*

[1] *Kärcher* (in the Freiburg Dioc. Arch., Vol. III., year 1868), has demonstrated that *Ueberlingen* is his birthplace. The Life and Writings of Henry Suso, by *Diepenbrock*, Ratisb., 1837. Opera latine reddidit *Surius*, Colon., 1555. Spiritual Flowers of Suso, Bonn, 1834. Patris *Amandi* Horologium sapientiæ, Colon., 1856. *H. Amandus'* Life and Writings, Vienna, 1863 sq. *C. Schmidt*, The mystic Henry Suso (Theol., Stud. and Critic., 1843, nro. 4.) *Stöckl*, Vol. II., pp. 1129-39.

[2] The information he here conveys is unique and highly interesting. He tells his routine in taking his meals—how he celebrated New Year's Day and Candlemas; how he spent his time during Carnival and the month of May; his feelings while making the sorrowful way of the cross with Christ; his thoughts during the singing of the *Sursum Corda* in the Mass, "for he was wont to sing these words with such feeling and pathos that those who heard him could hardly help being inspired with unusual devotion." Cf. *Diepenbrock's* edition of his works, pp. 16-29.

[3] Speculum salutis ætern.; summa totius vitæ spiritual.; in tabernac. Moys., etc. *Rusbrochii*, Opp. e Brabantiæ germanico idiomate redd. lat. per Surium, Colon., 1555. *Arnswald*, Four of John Ruysbroch's works, in Low-German, Hanov., 1848. Several other works of his, in Flemish, were published at Ghent by Professor *David*, of Louvain. Cf. *Engelhardt*, Hugo of St. Victor and John Ruysbroch, Essay on Myst. Theol., Erlang., 1838. *Ch. Schmidt*, Etude sur Jean Ruysbroch, Strasb., 1863; *Stöckl*, Vol. II., pp. 1137-49.

Catharine of Siena, *St. Bridget*, *St. Angela of Foligno*, the author of the *Theology of the Cross*, and *St. Catherine of Genoa*, the author of the *Theology of Love*, also belong to the mystics of this epoch.

The errors of Ruysbroch found a formidable adversary in *John Gerson* (*Doctor Christianissimus*), who, like Richard of St. Victor in a former age, made an effort to explain *scientifically* the aim and scope of Mysticism, to divest it of its transcendental character, and give it a practical direction.[1] The very essence of Mysticism, said he, consists in knowing God by experience of the heart. Love, which lifts the heart up to the very throne of God, effects an intimate union with the Divinity. As the object of speculative theology is the *true*, so is that of mystical theology the *good* and the *holy*. Scholasticism and Mysticism correspond to the faculties of the soul, by which one knows and desires, and understands and loves, and either of which leads to God. It is the office of Scholasticism to direct Mysticism and keep it within the bounds of truth. It is not enough to have an idea of God—the idea must pervade and animate the whole life of man; and to Mysticism belongs the office of turning to practical account truths which Scholasticism has seized upon and comprehended.

This great theologian, because he had the courage to rebuke John of Burgundy for murdering the Duke of Orleans, was obliged to leave his country and wander an exile through Germany. During this forced absence, and amid the trials that beset him in a strange land, he found comfort in religion, and threw his thoughts into connected form in his work entitled "*De consolatione theologiæ*."[2] When his persecutor had died, Gerson returned to Lyons, where, *it is said*, he took much pleasure in teaching young children catechism during the last years of his life, and where he died in the joy of the Lord (1429), universally venerated by the inhabitants as a saint.[3]

[1] Considerationes de theol. myst. (Opp. ed. du Pin, Antv., 1706, 5 T. f.) Cf. *Engelhardt*, De Gersone mystico, P. II., Erl., 1822 sq. 4to. *L'Ecuy*, Essai sur la vie de Gerson, Par., 1832, 2 T. *Ch. Schmidt*, Essai sur Jean Gerson, Strasb., 1139. *Thommassy*, Jean Gerson, Chancelier de Notre Dame et de l'Université de Paris, Par., 1843. *Schwab*, John Gerson, p. 325.

[2] Among the works of Gerson edited by *du Pin* is the *De consolatione theologiæ*, libb. IV., where the author has left an example of a soul, in exile and in the midst of trial, resolutely seeking comfort in the consolations of a good Christian life. The Dominican, John de Tambacho († 1372), had already set the example in his Speculum patientiæ, sive de consolatione theologiæ, Opp., T. I., pp. 125-183.

[3] Cf. *Gersoniana*, libb. IV., in ed. opp. Joan. Gerson by *du Pin*, T. I., pp. i-clxi. His real name was *Charlier;* Gerson is the name of his birthplace, in Champagne. He succeeded *d'Ailly* as chancellor of the University of Paris, and was not less erroneous in his teachings than his predecessor. At Constance he upheld the superiority of the council over the Pope. In his "*Opus de modo uniendi ac reformandi ecclesiam*," he draws a distinction between the "*ecclesia Catholica universalis*" and the "*Sedes Apostolica*," the latter of which he claims is only "*instrumentalis et operativa clavium universalis ecclesiæ, et executiva potestatis ligandi et solvendi*," and does not enjoy the prerogative of inerrancy. He also declaimed with immoderate warmth against reservations; annats, or the first year's revenue paid by a bishop into the papal treasury on taking possession of his see; expectancies, or the sum paid to the Roman Dataria for the promise of a preferment not yet fallen vacant; against the abuse of excommunication; the plurality of benefices vested in a single person; exemtion of monasteries (from episcopal authority), and their unnecessary muliplication; against a uselessly elaborate liturgy; the replacing of the principal and time-honoured

Towards the close of the Middle Ages, Mysticism seems to have existed in a tolerably pure state among the *Brethren of the Common Life* in the Netherlands. Here, *Florence Nadewijns* wrote his *Tractatus devotus s. de spiritualibus exercitiis*;[1] and here, too, *Thomas à Kempis* (*Hœmerken*), so called from a small town near Cologne, who was first a Brother of the Common Life, and, after receiving Orders, prior of the canons regular of St. Augustine of Agnetenberg, near Zwoll, wrote, besides his minor works, his *Imitation of Christ*,[2] in four books. This work, which, excepting the Holy Bible, is more generally read[3] than any existing book, contains the fundamental principles of the most exalted and genuine piety, and shows its author to have been one of the noblest and purest of Mystics. If surpassed in depth of thought by Tauler in his "*Imitation of the Indigent Life of Jesus*," Kempis is that writer's superior in the simplicity and purity of sentiment so dear to every heart. The pervading spirit of the work is a loving, an intimate, and a mysterious converse of the soul with God and Jesus Christ; and the means proposed by the author for arriving at this close intimacy with God is the frequentation of the Sacraments, constant meditation on the truths of Holy Writ, and a correct appreciation of the things of this world. Catching the true Christian inspiration of every age since the Church began, Kempis proclaims the *Eucharist* to be the central object of Christian worship and the great heart whence issue the streams of Christian life, and consistently makes this overwhelming mystery the subject of the last and longest book of the *Imitation*.

festivals of the Church by others of late introduction; and, finally, the sordid spirit of the clergy and the promotion of ignorant ecclesiastics, while others of distinguished ability were passed over for no other reason than that they were in indigent circumstances. *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 402. (Tr.)

1 Ed. **Nolte*, Friburgi, 1862.

2 His lesser works are: Soliloquia; Hortulus rosar.; Vallis lilior.; Hospitale pauperum; De solitudine et silentio; Hymni et cantica; Vitæ Beator. (Opp. omnia, ed. *Sommalius*, Antv., 1604, in 4to; in 16mo recog., *Amort*, Colon., 1757; ed. Franc. Xav., *Kraus*, Trevir., 1868.) His larger work, *De Imitatione Christi*, has been translated into six languages, the original being Latin, viz., Italian, Spanish, French, German, English, and Greek (ancient or classic); ed. *J. B. Weigl*, Solisbaci (Sulzbach) (not Ratisbon—Tr.), in Bavaria, 1837. The authorship of this celebrated work has been hotly contested from the seventeenth century onward, the French Benedictines and others claiming that either *Gerson* or a fictitious abbot, *Gersen* of Vercelli, was its author. Cf. *du Pin*, De auct. lib. de imitat. Chr. (Opp. Gerson, T. I., p. 121.) *Gregory*, Mémoire sur le véritable auteur de l'imitation de J. Chr. revue par le Comte Lonjuinæs, Par., 1827, transl. by *Weigl*, Sulzbach, 1832. *Silbert*, *Gersen* (Abbot of Vercelli), *Gerson* and *Kempis*, which is the author? Vienna, 1828. The authorship of the Imitation is now proved by the chronicle of Windeshem to belong to Thomas of Kempis. Among those who most ably championed his cause were *Amort* (Scutum Kempense, Colon., 1759, in the append. to his ed., and Deductio critica, Aug. Vindel., 1761); *Bähring*, Thomas of Kempis, the Preacher of the Imitation of Christ, Berlin, 1849, pp. 188-193. *Gregory*, Hist. du livre de l'imitat. de J. Chr. et son véritable auteur Paris, 1842, 2 T. (unimportant.) *Malou*, Recherches hist. et crit. sur le véritable auteur du livre de l'imitat., etc., III. ed., Paris, 1858. See Tübg. Quart., 1859, p. 319 sq. *Dr. Nolte*, Essay on the Hist. of the Book of the Imit. of Chr. (Scheiner & Häusle's Periodical, Vienna, 1855, VII., nros. 1, 2.) La *Civiltà Cattolica*, fr. Jan. to June, 1875, Della Controv. Gerseniana. (Tr.)

3 Over two thousand editions have been published in various languages, the first at Augsburg, 1468. Best ed. by *Rosweyd*, S.J., Antwerp, 1617, and oftener.

§ 286. *The so-called Revival of Learning by the Humanists.*

Tiraboschi, Storia della letteratura Italiana, T. V., Pt. I. *Meiners*, Biographies of illustrious men of the epoch of the Revival, Zurich, 1796 sq., 3 vols, Vite e Ritratti d'Illustri Italiani. (Tr.) *Jagemann*, Hist. of the Arts and Sciences in Italy, Vol. III., Pts. II. and III. *Heeren*, Hist. of classical Literature in the M. A. (Hist. works, Pts. IV. and V.) *Voigt*, The Revival of classic Antiquity, or 1st century of Humanism, Berlin, 1859. Cf. *Moehler* and *Erhard*, Hist. of the Revival of Learning, Magdeb., 1827-32, 3 vols. (Giesser, Annuary of Theol,, Vol. I., p. 173 sq.) *Stoeckl*, Hist. of the Philos. of the M. A., Vol. III.

It is now pretty generally taken for granted that the knowledge of classic literature in the West dates from the fall of Constantinople (1453), and that a taste for true science was revived in Europe by the fugitive scholars from the capital of the Greek Empire. The Schoolmen were the first to give to theology a scientific form, and, being themselves men of solid learning, they created a science at once new and exact, to which it would be well for some of the self-sufficient scientists of our own age to give a little serious study before superciliously assuming their own vast superiority. Is it necessary here to state that the greatest critics have placed the *poetical productions* of the Middle Ages beside the epopees of Homer, or to remind the reader that all the important sciences were cultivated in the universities *founded* in the preceding and flourishing in the present epoch? There was not an interval throughout the whole of the Middle Ages, when the *ancient classic authors* were neglected. This is evident from the writings of *John Scotus Erigena*, in the ninth century, and, in the tenth, from those of *Gerbert* and others, and from the heroic poems of the nun *Hroswitha*, all of whom exhibit an intimate acquaintance with the famous authors of antiquity. And what is true of the ninth and tenth centuries may be said of every succeeding age, particularly in regard to the Roman classics, which formed the *basis and guide* of the course of studies included in the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*. In the thirteenth century many translations of Greek authors—notably of Aristotle—made their appearance; and that original genius, *Raymond Lullus*, even proposed to establish a great institution in the very heart of the University of Paris for the study of Arabic and Greek literature.[1] Does not the fourteenth century furnish marvellous proofs of the ardour with which the study of antiquity was then pursued? Does not *Dante*,[2] in the *Divina Commedia*, that powerfal representation of the

[1] *Raym. Lullus* writes in a letter (*Martène* et *Durand*, Thesaur. Anecdot., T. II., p. 1319): "Hic conscientiæ stimulus me remordet et coëgit me venire ad vos, quorum summæ discretionis et sapientiæ interest ordinare circa tantum negotium tam pium, tam meritorium, tam Deo gratum servitium et utile toti mundo, videlicet quod hic Parisiis, ubi fons divinæ scientiæ oritur, ubi veritatis lucerna refulget populis Christianis, fundaretur *studium Arabicum, Tartaricum et Græcum, ut nos linguas adversariorum Dei et nostrorum docti*," etc.

[2] See the Catholicism of *Dante*, in the evangelical church paper of *Hengstenberg*, 1842, nros. 10-12, and *Goeschl*, Dante's instruction on the creation of the world, etc., Berlin, 1842. †*Artaud*, Histoire de Dante Alighieri, Par., 1842. Dante et la philosophie catholique au treizième siècle, par †*Ozanam*, Par., 1840; Germ., Münster, 1844. *Müller*, art. Dante, in the Freiburg Cyclopæd. Cf. p 788, note 1.

second creation, wrought through Christ, exhibit a devotion to Virgil quite as ardent as to St. Thomas? Is he not at once a true poet and a rigorous theologian? Did he not form his national language, prescribe rules of taste, and rouse into life and activity the latent energies of the human mind? Dante summons popes, religious orders, and the clergy before his tribunal, and passes judgment upon them. Florence banishes him, and the States of the Church receive the exile († 1321).

Again, *Petrarca*, the first and greatest of Italian lyric poets, was thoroughly imbued with the genius of antiquity. His writings breathe the very spirit of ancient Greece and Rome, and are warm with their life; and the chaste purity and sweetness of his songs (*Rime*) have done fully as much as Dante's Divina Commedia to refine the taste and language of Italy. He was crowned poet-laureate in the Capitol at Rome in 1341. An elegant poet, he was no less an unwearied student, and was engaged throughout his whole life in collecting Latin manuscripts, travelling through France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, in search of such treasures. He was the first scholar of modern times who, as his works abundantly show, wrote Latin with the classic purity of the Augustan age;[1] and at his voice all Europe turned to the zealous study of the old Roman models († 1374).

Boccaccio, the celebrated author of the *Decamerone*, whose limpid, airy, and graceful style places him in the foremost rank of Italian prose-writers, was also something more than a *litterateur*. He was a great collector of books, and transcribed with his own hand many rare Greek manuscripts. It is said he was the first Italian to procure from Greece copies of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer. He was also the first to familiarize himself with Greek ideas and modes of thought, and to arrange in systematic form an ancient mythology[2] with a view to facilitate the study of the classics.

Villani, a contemporary of Petrarca's, was not inferior to Herodotus as an historian; and mediæval writers, long anterior to the bard who sang the praises of Laura, gave Latin translations of the works of St. Chrysostom, St. John Climacus, St. Macarius, and of the orations of Demosthenes.

Cardinal *Nicholas de Cusa*, when returning from his mission to Constantinople, brought back with him a large quantity of Greek manuscripts, which excited no little interest in Europe; and he also gained for himself immortal renown as a mathematician and astronomer *by being first to proclaim and defend the theory that the earth moves around the sun.*

[1] The principal are his Epistolæ; De Vitis Virorum Illustrium; De Remediis utriusque Fortunæ; De Vita Solitaria; Rerum Memorandarum libri IV.; De Contemptu Mundi, etc. His "*Africa*," an epic poem on the second Punic war, procured him the laurel wreath. Of his *Rime*, 300 editions. Collective editions of his whole works, Basle, 1495, 1554, and 1591; Lyons, 1601, 2 T. f. Sonetti, Canzoni, Trionfi.

[2] De genealogia deorum, libb. XV., Bas., 1532, f. Decamerone. Germ. by *Witte*, 3rd ed., Lps., 1859, 5 vols.

The presence of the Orientals at the Council of Florence (1439) largely contributed to stimulate the study of Greek antiquity, and to the Church is due the entire credit of having guided taste in this direction. Her influence was at work and deeply felt long before the arrival of the fugitives from Constantinople, who were themselves, for the most part, priests and monks. The kind greeting and warm welcome which even the less distinguished of the refugees received, both at Rome and at Florence, where the house of Medici was then supreme, and for which they were indebted chiefly to the clergy, prove incontestably that these were not insensible to the charms of polite literature or destitute of a refined taste. It is, however, equally true that their minds were still further cultivated by such accomplished Hellenists as *Hermolaus Barbarus* († 1493), *Angelus Politianus*, and others. The revival of classic antiquity was soon felt in every part of Italy, and *the study of Pagan authors* everywhere lauded as the only source of human culture or *humanities*. From the year 1450 onward, troops of young men from every part of Europe flocked to Italy to frequent her academies and devote themselves to the newly revived studies, which were entirely independent of theology, until *Laurentius Valla*, successively professor at Naples and Rome († 1456), contemptuously putting aside the scholastic method, wrote, in elegant Latin, short and simple annotations on the text of the New Testament. He also wrote an *ethical* work, wholly pagan in tone, but probably as good as was consistent with a slavish imitation of profane antiquity. His historical works are of much greater merit.[1]

Paul Cortesius was more successful in his efforts to build up a system of Christian dogmatics on ancient Roman models.[2] Still, he did not, like others, adapt Christian truths and ecclesiastical institutions to Pagan mythology, Papal modes of thought, and Pagan expression.[3]

Many translations of the Bible shortly appeared, which, it was claimed, were far more *Ciceronian* in purity and style than the Vulgate. As a rule, these modern *Platonists* belonging to the academy founded at Florence in 1440 by *Gemistius Pletho*[4] still defended some

[1] Elegantiar. Latinæ linguæ, libb. VI.; dialectic., libb. III.; Annot. in N. T. (ed. Erasmus, Par., 1505, f., rep. Revius, Amst., 1631); *de summo bono;* de ementita Const. M. donatione (Opp. Bas., 1540 and 1543, f.).

[2] *Paul Cortesius* in Sententias. Qui in hoc opere eloquentiam cum theologia conjunxit, Rom., 1512, f. He dedicated this work to Pope Julius II. Cf. *Jagemann*, Hist. of the liberal arts, Vol. III., Pt. III., p. 219 sq.

[3] Thus *Bembo*, private secretary to Leo X., called Christ "*Minervam, e Jovis capite ortam;*" the Holy Ghost, "*Auram Zephyri cœlestis;*" and the *forgiving of sins*, "*Deos superosque manesque placare.*" Others styled the *Cardinals*, "*Patres conscripti*," and the Sacred College, "*Collegium augurum;*" priests, "*Flamines;*" nuns, "*Vestales;*" and the Blessed Virgin, "*Diva.*" It was said of St. Francis that he was "in numerum *Deorum* receptus," and, in still more offensive phrase, *Bessarion* comforted the son of Gemistius Pletho by telling him his departed father had risen into purer and heavenly spheres, and had joined the choirs of the Olympic gods in the mystic mazes of the Bacchanalian dance.

[4] *Sieveking*, Hist. of the Platonic Academy at Florence, Götting., 1812; *Roscoe* Lorenzo de' Medici; *Stöckl*, Vol. III., p. 136 sq

of the truths of Christianity; and many of them—and these the more distinguished, as, for example, *Marsilio Ficino* and *Pico della Mirandola*—endeavoured to show that all the leading religious truths found among various peoples might be traced back to one primitive revelation; but a large number of them also placed Plato before Christ. Ficino, who held Platonism to be the basis of the Christian system, was so devoted to Plato that he kept a light burning before his image, and proposed that his works, like the books of Holy Writ, should be publicly read in the churches. Pletho even expressed the hope that Christianity would develop into a universal religion not unlike Paganism. *Angelo Poliziano* (*Politianus*), a pupil of Marsilio Ficino's, became, as a humanist, poet, and philosopher, almost as famous as his master.[1]

Side by side with these modern Platonists rose a school of Neo-Peripaticians, or disciples of *Aristotle*, zealous defenders of their *peculiar tenets*, and dangerously sceptical. Their leading representative, *Pietro Pomponazzo*, a professor at Padua and Bologna († 1526), openly declared that, from a philosophical point of view, the immortality of the soul and the providence of God were extremely problematical, but might be accepted as theological verities.[2] This proposition was severely censured by the *Fifth Œcumenical Council of Lateran*, and measures enacted to put a stop to so unwarrantable an abuse of the Pagan classics and philosophy. The learned and infamous *Macchiavelli* († 1530), in his work *De Principatibus*, or, as it has since been called, *Del Principe*, or *The Prince*, advocated a radically Pagan system, having nothing in common with Christianity, and being only a faithful reproduction of the faithless policy of ancient Rome. The essential and most prominent element of the system consistently and logically developed in *The Prince*, is an intense and crafty selfishness.[3]

Many of the *Humanists*, following the current of public opinion, drifted into indifferentism, and substituted for the spirit of Christianity the empty forms of an idolatrous and sensuous worship. At the opening of the fifteenth century the alarm had already been sounded by *Vincent Ferrer*. "The golden light of a holy life," said he, "is no longer visible in the world; the glowing effulgence shed upon souls by the teachings of the Gospel has faded away, and in interpreting Holy Scripture it has become fashionable to adopt a sort of poetic refinement and philosophic flavour that make the

[1] Opera, Basil., 1554, fol. Cf. *Bonafous*, De Ang. Polit. vita et operibus, Paris, 1846.

[2] *Petri Pomponatii*, Lib. de immortal. animæ, Bon., 1516. Cf. Erasmi, lib. XXVI., ep. 34. *Harduin*, Coll. Concilior., T. IX., p. 1719 sq. Cf. The Materialism of Petrus Pomponatius (*Catholic*, February number of 1861). *Stöckl*, Vol. III., p. 202 sq.

[3] Discorsi sopra la prima Dec. di T. Livio; *Principe;* Storia Fiorentina. Conf. *Possevini*, Judicium de Macchiavello. *Ribadeneira*, De principe Christiano adv. Macch. cæterosque huj. sæc. politicos, Antv., 1603, and oftener. *Bozius Eugubinus*, lib. unus ctr. Macchiavellum, Colon., 1601. † *Artaud*, Macchiavelli, son génie et ses erreurs, Par., 1833, 2 T. *Freiburg*, Cyclopæd., Vol. VI., p. 712 sq.; French transl., Vol. 14, pp. 69-76.

preacher less a disciple of Christ than a worshipper of Cicero and Aristotle."

At the close of this same century, another voice—that of *Jerome Savonarola*—was heard thundering from the pulpit against the Pagan spirit pervading all classes. "The refinement of our souls," said he, "loathes the banquet of Holy Scripture. We listen to the eloquence of Cicero, to the music of the poet's song, to the mellifluous language of Plato, and to the subtle reasoning of Aristotle. This we enjoy, but the Holy Bible is far too simple for our tastes. Women may be pleased with this, but not we. Preach to us in a tone of scholarly sublimity if you would be abreast of the spirit of the age."

It need astonish no one that tendencies so subversive of Christian principles and traditions should have been violently opposed by rigorous theologians and trained Schoolmen. Nor can anyone fairly complain of such a course, or regard it as unfortunate. And if these champions of orthodoxy were sometimes carried beyond the bounds of legitimate warfare in their contemptuous denunciation of the new opinions, it should be borne in mind that they themselves did not escape the shafts of envenomed satire and fierce invective. Indeed, an antagonist with whom they might have occasional tilts was as indispensable to the Humanists of the fifteenth century as a lady-love to whom they might write amorous sonnets and say pretty things.[1]

It cannot, however, be denied that in the early days of the revival, classic studies exercised a beneficial influence in Germany, and were turned to good account by the *Brethren of the Common Life*, who, in their schools, made them a vehicle for conveying religious instruction.[2] With them linguistic studies were made subservient to the attainment of a more complete and thorough knowledge of the Christian religion, which they regarded as the *summum bonum* and the end and object of all knowledge. In these schools did *Nicholas de Cusa*, and others equally or less eminent, receive the first rudiments of literary culture and scientific training.

Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (*the guest of popes and princes*), the most accomplished literary scholar of this epoch, used the philological knowledge thus acquired in illustrating the text of Holy Writ and making translations of the Fathers of the Church, doing for ecclesiastical literature what he had done at an earlier age for the Pagan classics.[3] Still, the same writer assailed in his work, entitled "*The Praise of Folly*" (ἐγκώμιον μώριας), with great severity, vigour

[1] Cf. *Roscoe's* Lorenzo dei Medici (Germ., Vienna, 1817).

[2] *Delprat*, Over the Broederschap van G. Groote, Arnhem (1830), 1856; with additions, by Mohnike, Lps., 1840.

[3] Especially Colloquium. Ciceronianus. Adagia. Epistolæ. Moriæ encomium. Enchir. militis Christ. Ratio veræ Theol. Matrimonii chr. institutio. Ecclesiastes. *Novum Testamentum Græce; versio, annotationes, Paraphrasis N. T.*, best edition of *St. Augustine*, Berol., 1778-80, 3 T., 8vo. Conf. *Ad. Müller*, Life of Erasmus of Rotterdam, Hamburg, 1828. *Lieberkühn*, De Erasmi ingenio et doctrina, Jenæ, 1836. *Durand de Laur*, Erasme précurseur et imitateur de l'esprit moderne, Paris, 1872, 2 vols.

of thought, and brilliancy of style, the ignorance of the monks, the degeneracy of the Monasticism, and the worthlessness of the Scholasticism of his age. He also deplored the menacing advances of Paganism, which exercised an extremely mischievous influence on himself, in blunting, and, in a measure, destroying in him his religious feeling and attachment to the Church. *Rudolph Agricola*, a native of Friesland and a professor at Heidelberg, who exercised a paramount influence in promoting the scientific culture of Southern Germany, did not allow his love of classic literature to estrange him from the Church. *Conrad Celtes*,[1] a professor at Vienna (1497), who published editions of many of the ancient authors, and was the first poet-laureate of *Germany* († 1508), was not less devoted to the Church than the Heidelberg professor. Equally loyal to Catholic principles were the Spaniard, *Louis Vivès* († 1540), and the Frenchman, *William Budæus* († 1540, aged seventy-three years), who, with Erasmus, formed the famous literary triumvirate. Each of these three remarkable men was distinguished by a special gift. With Erasmus, it was a copious diction (*dicendi copia*); with Budæus, a brilliant intellect (*ingenio*), and with Vivès, a mature judgment (*judicio*).[2] In England, also, there were such men as *Fisher*, Bishop of Rochester; *John Colet*, Dean of St. Paul's, London; *Lilly*, professor in the cathedral-school of St. Paul's; and *Thomas More*,[3] the statesman and faithful friend of Erasmus; all of whom united to an enlightened zeal for reform in morals and discipline a sincere love of antiquity and an ardent attachment to the Church.

§ 287. *The Study of the Holy Scriptures—Spread of the Bible among the People.*

†*Richard Simon*, Hist. critique des principaux commentateurs du N. T. *Rosenmüller* Hist. interpretationis libror. sacror. in Eccles. Christ.; ed. II., Lps., 1814, 5 vols. *Meyer* Hist. of St. Hermeneutics, Göttingen, 1802-1809, 5 vols. *Glaire*, Introd. à l'Ecrit. s. IIIème ed., Par., 1861. *Dixon*, Introd. to the S. Script., Balt., 1853.

As Gerbert, in the tenth century, had laid the foundation of his vast erudition among the Arabs of Cordova, so now the Christians, stimulated by the labours of the *Jewish commentators of Spain*,[4] put aside, for a time, their Latin translations and applied themselves to the study of the Bible, particularly the Old Testament, in the languages in which the various books were *originally* written, availing themselves of the philological researches of the age to acquire an

[1] *Tresling*, Vita et merita Rud. Agricolæ, Groning., 1830. *Klüpfel*, De vita et scriptis Conradi Celti, etc., Frib., 1813-1829, XII. Partic.

Louis Vivès deserves to be remembered on account of his celebrated commentary on St. Augustine's City of God, *De disciplinis*, of which there were many editions. Cf. Vol. I., p. 496, n. 2. Of the writings of *Budæus*, the most deserving of study is his *De transitu Hellenismi ad Christianismum*, Paris, 1575.

[3] De optimo reipubl. statu deque nova insula Utopia. Cf. †*Rudhardt*, Thos. Morus, according to the sources, Nürnberg, 1829. *Thommes*, Thos. Morus, Lord Chancellor of England, Augsburg, 1847. Cf. *v. Redwitz*, Thos. Morus, a tragedy, act. ii., scene 2.

[4] See p. 563, Vol. 2

accurate knowledge of the literal sense. The Church, far from discouraging, gave her most decided support to these efforts at a very early age. The Council of Vienne, held under Pope Clement V. in 1311, passed a decree providing for the foundation of chairs of Hebrew, Chaldaic, Arabic, and Greek[1] at Rome, Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca. It is indeed true that these were founded primarily with a view to facilitate the work of foreign *missions*, but it is equally true that their influence in promoting higher studies generally, and sacred hermeneutics in particular, was highly productive of good.

The first great name in this department of study is *Nicholas de Lyra*,[2] a converted Jew, who afterwards entered the Order of St. Francis, and became professor of theology at the University of Paris (*Postillator, Doctor planus et utilis*) [† 1341]. Nicholas, without entirely diregarding the *allegorical, moral*, and *anagogical sense*, gave special attention to the *literal* or grammatical and historical exposition of the Sacred Text, for which, by his thorough knowledge of the Oriental languages, he was so eminently qualified. His influence on *succeeding ages* is sufficiently attested by the familiar saying: "*Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset.*"

In the fifteenth century, *Alphonsus Tostatus*, a Doctor of the University of Salamanca, and subsequently Bishop of Avila († 1454), wrote exhaustive commentaries on nearly all the books of the Old Testament and on the Gospel of St. Matthew, in which he displays great erudition, and satisfactorily answers the objections of Spanish Jews. Tostatus was present at the Council of Basle when the decree of Vienne was confirmed and renewed. Measures were now taken to carry its instructions into effect.

Tiraboschi gives .the names of several Italian Oriental scholars of the fifteenth century; among whom are the monk *James Philip of Bergamo, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Palmieri, Giavozzo, Manetti*, and many more.

Shortly after the opening of the sixteenth century, *Agostino Giustiniano* went to work on his polyglot edition of the Psalms, and *Tesio Ambrogio* was appointed by Leo X. professor of the Oriental languages at Bologna.

In Spain, Cardinal *Ximenes*[3] published a polyglot Bible, containing Hebrew, Chaldaic, Greek, and other versions. He also published dictionaries and grammars, specially prepared by Spanish scholars, to facilitate the acquiring of the biblical languages.

It should be borne in mind here, that these great efforts had been

[1] *Clement.*, lib. V. Tit. I., c. 1 (Corp. Jur. Canon.)

[2] His principal work is Postillæ perpetuæ in biblia, Rom., 1471, 5 vols. f., best edition cura *Fr. Feuardentii, J. Dadrei* et *Jac. de Cuilly*, Ludg., 1590. Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. VI., p. 688 sq.; French transl., Vol. 14, p. 39 sq.

[3] Biblia sacra; vetus testam. multiplici lingua nunc primo impressum, T. I.-V.; N. T., T. VI., Compluti, 1514-17, f. Conf. †*E. Flechier*, Histoire du Card. Ximenes, Par., 1643, 2 T.; Germ. by *P Fritz*, Würzb,, 1828, 2 Pts. *J. de Marsolier*, Hist. du ministère du Card. Xim., Toul., 1694. **Hefele*, Cardinal Ximenes, and the condition of the Church in Spain at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, Tüb., 1844, pp. 120-158.

made before the time of *Reuchlin;* for, even in our own day, there are still people ignorant enough to assert that "Hebrew was almost unknown among Christians when he appeared upon the earth." In the very town of Tübingen, and contemporary with Reuchlin, flourished the Franciscan *Summenhardt*, *Paul Scriptoris*, and *Conrad Pelican*, all Hebraists. Even as early as 1505, *John Loeschenstein*, who had acquired a knowledge of Hebrew by his own efforts, and wholly independent of either Reuchlin or Pelican, was invited by Doctor Eck to teach Hebrew at Ingolstadt. But the scholarly and classic *Reuchlin*, who was indebted to *John Wessel* for his knowledge of Hebrew, should not be deprived of the honour of having greatly promoted the study of the original text of the Old Testament; although rabbinical lore was to him a much higher authority than the truths of Christianity.[1] This will explain why the converted Jew *Pfefferkorn*,[2] Hogstraten, and the other *Dominicans of Cologne* carried their opposition to him to so violent an extreme as to demand that "all rabbinical books should be burned." This opposition, however, was not provoked by jealousy, nor did it arise from any fear of what new lights might reveal, nor from a desire to check the growing interest in linguistic studies, but was directed solely against the undue importance attached to the learning of the rabbinists. Nay, more, *John Potken*, Provost of St. George's and one of the ablest Oriental scholars of that age, and *Ortwin Gratius*, equally eminent as a humanist and defender of the Dominicans, so far as their opposition was capable of defence,[3] both resided in Cologne, which, it was pretended, was the congenial home of obscurantism.

[1] De verbo mirifico libb. III., Tüb., 1514, f. De arte cabbalist. libb. III., Hag., 1517. De rudiment. hebr. Phorcæ, 1506, f.; Bas., 1573, f. De accentib. et orthographia ling. hebr., Hagæ, 1518, ff.; Epp., Hag., 1514. *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. IX., p. 233 sq.; French transl., Vol. 20, p. 194 *Mayerhoff*, Reuchlin and his Age, Berlin, 1830; *Lamey*, John Reuchlin, being a biographical sketch, Pforzheim, 1855; *Geiger*, John Reuchlin, his Life and His Works, Lps., 1871.

[2] *Pfefferkorn*, De judaica confessione, Colon., 1508. De abolendis scriptis Judæorum. Narratio de ratione celebrandi Pascha apud Judæos. Cf. *Hogstraten*, Destructio cabbalæ seu cabbalisticæ perfidiæ adv. Reuchlinum, Antv., 1518. Contra dialogum de causa Reuchlini, et Apologiæ contra Reuchlinum. Cf. *v. d. Hardt*, Hist. litter. Ref., Pars. II. *Grœne*, in the Tüb. Quart., 1862, nro. 1, pp. 132-138.

[3] Against the *Epp. obscuror. viror.* (lib. I., Hagenau, 1516; lib. II., Basil., 1517; new editions, by *Münch*, Lps., 1827; by Rotermund, Hanov., 1830; by *E. Böcking*, Lps., 1858), Gratius wrote, by way of retaliation, the *Lamentationes obscur. virorum*, of which there were many editions, and but recently, another in a revised text, edited by *E. Böcking*, Lps., 1865. *Weislinger*, Huttenus delarvatus, i. e., a true account of the authorship of the *Epist. viror. obscur.*, with a history of the quarrel between Reuchlin and Pferfferkorn, etc., Constance, 1730. New investigations on the authors of the *Epp. obsc. vir.*, by *Mohnike* (Journal of Hist. Theol., 1843, nro. 3, and in *Böcking*).

"The *Epp. obs. viror.* are a fictitious correspondence between *Ortuinus Gratius*, professor at Cologne, and his own and Pfefferkorn's friends. They are the production of a club of Erfurt humanists, and probably contain contributions from Crotus Rubianus, Mutian, Ulrich von Hutten, Eoben Hesse, and others. They are written in villainous monkish Latin, and supposed to portray the violence of party feuds and the private life and secret thoughts of monks, who are so unjustly assailed and so mercilessly ridiculed, that they have never quite recovered from the shock then sustained."

"The *Lamentationes obscurorum virorum*, as a reply, was feeble, and wholly inefficient. There can be no doubt that the Friar Preachers of Cologne, and their equally spiritless friends, the representatives and victims of an effete formalism, were in the wrong from the

That the zeal of the Dominicans against the study of the Oriental languages was extravagant and unenlightened, is evident from the rebuke of the Bishop of Spire, apostolic delegate of Leo X. (1514), who told them that the Church had at all times held the legitimate use of such study in highest esteem; and from the failure of Hogstraten to secure a reversal of this judgment in Rome. It is to be regretted, however, that the Humanists abused their victory. They not only put into circulation libellous writings (*Epistolæ obscurorum virorum*) concerning their adversaries, but one of them, *Ulrich of Hutten*, availed himself of the favourable occasion to boldly attack the Papacy.

We must not omit mentioning here the valuable services rendered by *Erasmus* to exegetics, by the *publication* of the Greek text of the New Testament, with a *translation*, a *paraphrase*, and short explanatory *notes*, for which he drew largely upon the labours of Greek expounders.

In France, the way was opened to an enlightened criticism by *Lefebvre d'Etaples* († 1537), who wrote commentaries on the Sacred Text, and made translations of it into the vulgar tongue. His freedom of interpretation[1] was in some instances so unwarranted as to incur ecclesiastical censure.

Although *approved translations* of the principal books of the Bible, which the Church has never prohibited,[2] had existed since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and were read by the people, the desire to acquire a knowledge of Sacred History, and the efforts put forth to supply this desire, had never been so manifest as in the present epoch. The printing-presses of France, England, Germany, and Italy were kept busy turning out complete editions of the Bible in the various

beginning to the end of this controversy. Moreover, it would seem that the motives of Reuchlin's conduct were above suspicion, for his loyalty to the Church was proof against even the seductive offers of Luther and of his own cousin, Melanchthon. But, on the other hand, as Pfefferkorn subsequently remarked, had it not been for the great scandal caused by the Reuchlin affair, it would never have entered into the heads and hearts of Luther and the disciples of the '*Obscurantists*' to attempt what they did, now openly and boldly, against the Christian faith." *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 431. (Tr.)

[1] James Faber, surnamed d'Etaples, from his birthplace, near Boulogne-sur-mer. His works are Psalterium quintuplex, Paris, 1509; Comment. in epp. Pauli, Paris, 1512; in IV. evang., Meld., 1522; French Bible, complete, in 1523, Antwerp, 1530, f.

[2] Hence the Catholic episcopacy of England publicly declared, in 1826 (see § 404), that the "Catholic Church has never either prohibited or hindered the reading of the Holy Scriptures in authentic versions, or in the original text. *Neither has the Church ever made a general law* forbidding the reading of *approved translations* of the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue." This freedom has never been restricted, except in individual instances and particular localities, and then only because the restriction was justified by the spirit of the age. The Waldenses and Albigenses, who, in attempting to overthrow Church and State, *appealed to the Bible* in justification of their conduct, supply examples of our meaning. Those who cite the letter of Innocent III. (lib. II., ep. 141), as proving the contrary, seem ignorant of the fact that this Pope nowhere forbids the reading of a translation of the Bible; he simply admonishes the Bishop of Metz to examine and correct the translation in question. The Council of *Toulouse* (1229) and that of *Tarragona* (1234), under circumstances similar to those already referred to, forbade the use of the French translation, and the Church, for analogous reasons, employed the same caution in the sixteenth century; *but in no single instance did she ever prohibit* the reading of the Bible in the language of any country.

vernaculars, to supply the growing popular demand.[1] In Germany alone, between the year 1460 and the moment when Luther made his appearance, there appeared at least fourteen editions of the Bible in the High German and five in the Low German dialect.[2] The assertion, therefore, that Luther was the first to extricate the Bible from the obscurity in which it had been so long concealed, to translate it into German and bring it to the knowledge of his countrymen, is absolutely false, although he himself was not ashamed to lay claim to this honour. "It is as plain as the sun in the heaven," says he (Preface to his edition of the *German Theology*), "that nothing equal to this has for many a day been accomplished by the Universities, because there things have come to such a pass that the Word of God lies huddled away under the benches, dusty, forgotten, and worm-eaten."

We are now in a position to take a comprehensive view of this scientific revival. Let us, therefore, before passing judgment, try to appreciate at their true value the results of the *historical criticism* called into life by such men as *Nicholas de Cusa*, *Laurentius Valla*, *Antoninus*, Archbishop of Florence; *John*, Abbot of Trittenheim, and Canon *Cranz;* and the historical works of *Macchiavelli*, *Bembo*, *Guicciardini*, *Æneas Sylvius*, and so many others. Having done this, we shall not merely own to a deep feeling of satisfaction, but we shall be struck with wonder and admiration at the stupendous progress made in every branch of *scientific culture*. Our *only* cause of regret will be that science, once so closely allied to the Church, should now revolt against her authority, and seriously impede the growth of spiritual life by needlessly hastening a moral revolution, which, of its nature, moves stubbornly and slowly.

[1] A list of translations into different languages is found in *Lelong*, Bibliotheca sacra in binos syllabos distincta; subjiciuntur grammatica et lexica præsertim Orientalium, etc., Paris, 1723, 2 vols. fol. Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. XII., pp. 1210-14; French transl., Vol. 24, pp. 14-20. **Reuss*, Hist. of the Holy Script. of the N. T., 4th ed., Brunswick, 1864, pp. 440-519.

[2] The first edition appeared without either date or printer's name, but with the armorial bearings of Frederic III. (in 1460 or 62—probably at Mentz.) Other editions were published successively at Mentz, 1467; at Nürnberg, 1477, 1483, 1490, and 1518; at Augsburg, 1477, 1480, 1483, 1487, 1490, 1494, 1507, 1518, and 1524; at Strasburg, 1485. These editions, all in *High German*, are not reprints, but new translations. Editions of the Bible in Low German were published at Cologne between 1470-80; at Delft, 1477; at Gouda, 1479, and at Louvain, 1518; and in the Lower Saxon dialect, at Lübeck, 1494, and at Halberstadt, 1522. See *Panzer*, Literary notices of the most ancient German Bible in print, Nürnberg, 1774, and Hist. of the Roman Catholic Bible in German, Nürnberg, 1781. *Kehrein*, Historical essay on German translations of the Bible *before* Luther, together with thirty-four different German translations of Matthew v., Stuttg., 1851.

CHAPTER IV.

SPIRITUAL LIFE—WORSHIP—PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE.

§ 288. *Spiritual Life.*

Conf. **Gams*, The Saints of the Catholic Church during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries (*Moehler's* Ch. Hist., Vol. III., pp, 36-52, with copious bibliography).

In treating of the spiritual life of the Church, Protestant historians have always been at special pains to ferret out, collect, and expose to public view, whatever had the flavour of scandal or corruption; and not content with naked facts, they have, in many instances, exaggerated and misrepresented; but, as if things were still not exactly to their purpose, they have concealed *whatever of virtue the Church preserved in evil times*, and been silent when concealment was impossible. Faithful to our rule, we shall present facts fairly, and give praise and blame where they are deserved.[1]

The deplorable condition of the Papacy was quite as disastrous in its influence upon the spiritual life of the bulk of the faithful as upon the body of the clergy. Throughout the whole of the great schism, men's minds were constantly torn by the strife of party conflict. Everything was unsettled. "Which is the true Pope?"—"How shall we recognize him?"—"Under whose obedience shall we range ourselves?"—were questions that were continually asked during those evil days, but never elicited a satisfactory reply. Religious feeling seemed about to perish from the earth, and the secular clergy and the monks alike were, in their actual condition, incapable of either preserving what still remained or reviving what had been lost. The glowing tender piety that in former days had warmed the hearts of the faithful had grown chill and lifeless; the vulgar *Meistersingers* had succeeded to the refined and lyric *Minnesingers*. *Superstition*, sorcery, and *witchcraft*, in their various forms, had seized upon all, but particularly the lower and more ignorant classes of the people.[2] Simultaneously with the cultivation, in the fifteenth century, of *cabalistic* science by the Moors and Arabs, who were much addicted to *sorcery*, *magic*, *alchemy*, *astrology*, *theurgy*, and *necromancy*, were introduced superstitious practices among the Christians. *Petrarca* had early ridiculed the vagaries of the former; Pope *John XXII.*

1 *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 392. (Tr.)

2 *Hauber*, Bibliotheca, acta et scripta magica, Lemgo, 1739-43. *Horst's* Demonology, or Hist. of Sorcery and Satanic Miracles, since Innocent VIII., 2 pts., Francf. on the Main, 1818. See also the Magic Library, by the *same*, Mentz, 1821-26, 6 pts. *Soldan*, Hist. of Witches' trials according to the sources, Stuttgart, 1843. *Bonn Journal* of Philos. and Cath. Theology, year 1844, nro. 1, p. 71 sq. Dr. *Haas*, The Trials of Witches, Hist. Essay on human Development, accompanied with Documents, Tübg., 1865. *Lecky*, Hist. of Rationalism in Europe, New York, 1866, 2 vols., ch. 1.

published a bull against alchemy; and the Sorbonne, at the instance of *Gerson*, condemned the manifold superstitions of the age in an instrument of twenty-eight articles. *Sixtus IV.* threatened with punishment anyone who should have recourse to these illicit arts, and *Innocent VIII.* issued rigorous decrees against sorcery, and appointed *Sprenger* and *Henry Institor* two special judges to try offenders in Germany, where the delusion was most widespread. The code enacted to try witches went by the name of the "*Witches' Hammer*" (*Malleus Maleficarum*), and the authorisation for their condemnation was sought in the words of Leviticus xx. 27: "A man or woman in whom there is a pythonical or divining spirit, dying, let them die." Thousands of these deluded people expiated their folly at the stake.[1] The bulls issued by Popes to prevent such executions were as utterly disregarded and of as little effect as those published against the persecutors of the Jews. (See § 295).[2] But in the midst of this general decline, new orders and confraternities sprung up, won the affections of the people, made their influence felt, and prevented the religious sentiment from becoming wholly extinct. The faith, which the clergy had frequently neglected to preach to the people, was kept alive and fostered among them by the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the language of the country. *John Tauler*, *Suso*, *Ruysbroch*, *Thomas à Kempis*, the Society of *the friends of God*, and other mystics, edified the people of Germany by their exemplary lives; while their writings, composed for the most part in the vulgar tongue, made a powerful appeal to the noblest impulses of the heart. In Spain, *Vincent Ferrer*, the marvel of his own and succeeding ages, preached penance with such terrible vehemence as to again renew the extravagance of the Flagellants; and *John Capistran*, a Franciscan, led an equally marvellous life in Italy, Germany, and Hungary.[3]

The number of men who lived during this epoch, and whom the Church has enrolled among her canonized saints, is very considerable.[4] Nothing can be more edifying or more characteristic of these times than the life of Brother *Nicholas of Flüe* among the Alps of Switzerland. Having done his duty by his native country, as a father, a warrior, and a civil magistrate, he was suddenly seized with a burning

[1] Cf. *Freiburg*, Cyclopæd., Vol. V., p. 155 sq.; French transl., Vol. 22, p. 301.

[2] Still more unfavourable traits, especially concerning the clergy, are delineated in *Zimmer's* Chronicle, published by *Barack*. See p. 1.

[3] For the bibliography on both of them, see § 292.

[4] In the fourteenth century: Andreas Corsinus, Florentinus, episcop. Fæsulanus; Joh. Nepomucenus, canonicus Pragensis; Peregrinus e Foro Livii, ordin. servor. B. Mariæ; Conradus Placentinus, eremita of the Third Order of St. Francis; Rochus natione Gallus, sacris peregrinationibus devotus; Catharina, filia St. Brigittæ, abbatissa; Catharina Senensis; Julia Falconeria Florentina; Elisabetha, Portugalliæ regina; Elzearius comes et Delphina uxor ejus. In the fifteenth century: Joh. Cantius, presb. sæcularis Cracoviæ; Joh. a St. Facundo Augustinianus Salmanticensis; Didacus Franciscanus, Lay-brother; Nicolaus (of Flüe); *Casimirus*, of the royal family of Poland; Ferdinandus, of the royal family of Castile and Leon; Catharina Bononiensis, Clarissa; Veronica, an Italian Lay-sister; Coletta, virgo in Gallia; Ledwina, virgo in Hollandia; Francisca, matrona Romana, sancta vidua; Bernardinus Senens.; Antoninus, archiepiscopus Florentinus; Hemming, archiepiscopus Upsalensis, canonizatus A. D. 1513, et Nicolaus Suecensis, 1520.

love and ardent desire for his heavenly home;[1] and retiring into solitude, he held holy converse with his God, and for twenty years took no food other than the Holy Eucharist. He was constantly reciting this artless prayer: "O God, withdraw me from myself; make me wholly thine; destroy in me whatever may alienate me from Thee." It was the old cry—"*Deserere creaturas, quærere Creatorem.*" To the shepherds on the mountain-sides his presence was a heavenly apparition, and a beacon-light to those afar off. Keenly sensitive to the evils that afflicted the Church, he showed her the loyal and loving devotion of an humble child. In 1481, he effected, through his friendly mediation, the treaty of Stanz, and thus became an angel of peace to his divided fellow-countrymen.

The influence of *St. Catharine of Siena* was still more efficacious for good, and exercised a great power upon questions the most vital to the well-being of the Church.[2] Born of poor parents, she was, from her tenderest years, given to the meditation of heavenly things, and was abundantly blessed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost. She regarded the Dominicans as earthly angels appointed to protect her during life, and was so completely absorbed in the contemplation of our Saviour's life that, like Nicholas of Flüe, she subsisted for months together upon the Bread of Life. *Next to the Sacred Heart of Jesus*, her wide charity embraced the whole world, and yearned for its weal. All Italy flocked to her humble dwelling to consult her on their troubles and crave her mediation in allaying the bloody feuds of those disastrous times. Passing from a life of prayer and quiet to the bustle and distractions of the world, she was taken with catalepsy. An intimate communing with God, the uninterrupted presence of a heavenly atmosphere, were conditions of her being. She could not live without them. She died, in 1380, while pouring forth aspirations of the most tender love to her heavenly Spouse. Her canonisation was temporarily retarded by the objections of the Franciscans, but finally took place under Pius II. in 1461.

Another example and manifestation of the interior life of the Church in this epoch is St. Bridget, daughter of the King of Sweden; while the *Maid of Orleans* is a representative of the patriotic type of Christian heroes and heroines who, at intervals, rouse to the highest point the national energies of whole peoples.[3] It may be that the

[1] *John von Müller*, Hist. of the Swiss Confederacy, Vol. VI. †*Widmer*, Development of the divine element in the terrestrial element, proved by the example of Nicholas of Flüe, Lucerne, 1819; *Businger*, Brother Claus and his age, Lps., 1827. †*Görres*, God in Hist., Munich, 1831, 1st nro. †*Ming*, Blessed Brother Nicholas of Flüe, his Life and Influence, Lucerne, 1861 sq., 2 vols.

[2] See her life in the *Bollandists*, mens Apr., T. III., p. 853 sq. Her writings (Letters, Colloquies, Revelations), Ital. ed., by *Gigli*, Sien., 1707 sq., 5 vols., 4to. Cf. *Fabric*, Biblioth. med. ed. infim. Lat., T. I., p. 363 sq. Her theology of Love, transl. Aix-la-Chapelle, 1833; *Poesl*, Life of St. Catharine of Siena, according to her biography, by her confessor, Raymond of Capua, General of the Dominicans, Passau, 1841. For further bibliography, see above, p. 21, note 2.

[3] **Guido Görres*, The Maid of Orleans, Ratisbon, 1834. Dr. *Strass* (Jurist), Jeanne d'Arc, Brl., 1862. **Eysell*, Johanna d'Arc, Ratisbon, 1864. *Hase*, The Maid of Orleans, Lps., 1861. **Wallon*, J. d'Arc, 2nd ed., Paris, 1867.

exclusive devotion of this heroic maiden to her country, or her premature death at the stake (Rouen, May 30, 1431), has prevented her being numbered among the saints of the Church. Be this as it may, her memory is enshrined and held in veneration by the gallant people of France, which she loved with a religious enthusiasm and freed from the ignominious yoke of England. Pope *Calixtus III.*, at the request of Charles VII., ordered a revision of the proceedings so iniquitously conducted by the University of Paris, to whose tender mercies she had been consigned by *Peter Cauchon*, Bishop of Beauvais, and the pliant tool of the English, which resulted in a reversal of the first verdict. Her memory was thus cleared of the charge, brought against her, of having superstitiously fancied divine revelations and then professed to believe in them.[1] Many monuments have been erected in her honour by the inhabitants of Orleans.

When we find characters such as these in every country of Europe, we think it may be safely affirmed that their energetic and united protest at the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle would have wrought, even in spite of the opposition of individual popes, a peaceable and steady reformation of abuses, much more speedily and more efficiently than did the terrrible storms and insane excesses that characterized the opening of the succeeding period.

At the last council held in the Lateran, which closed in 1517, *Giles of Viterbo*, an Augustinian monk, pointed out the true principle of a fruitful reform. "It is," said he, "not lawful for man to change holy things, but to use them as instruments of his conversion (*Homines per sacra immutari fas est, non sacra per homines*). The same fearless churchman thus addressed Pope Julius II.: "Your whole attention should be given to providing means for the improvement of morals, the advancement of spiritual life, the restraining of vice, luxury, and the propagation of error." Germany had more reason than perhaps any other country to look hopefully to the future; for, if the narrative of an unfriendly and even hostile historian may be trusted, she possessed a learned and virtuous episcopacy, among whom we find such eminent names as *John of Dalberg*, at Worms; *John Rhode*, at Bremen; *Lawrence of Bibra*, at Würzburg; *Conrad of Thungen* and *Christopher of Stadion*, at Augsburg; *Matthias Lang*, at Salzburg, and the pious *Greifen*, at Treves. There was nothing, at this time, capable of accomplishing so much good as *the holding of synods at regular intervals*, and, unfortunately, nothing to which churchmen were less inclined.

§ 289. *History of the Older Religious Orders.*

Holstenius, Codex regular. monasticar., etc. The works of *Helyot*, *Biedenfeld*, *Henrion-Fehr*, and others. See bibliography heading, § 142. Cf. *Winter*, The Cistercians of North Germany, Gotha, 1871, Pt. III.

It is very evident from the canons of councils that the older religious orders had lost the spirit of their holy founders. To this

[1] **Guicherat*, Procès de condemnation et de réhabilitation de J. d'Arc, 5 vols., Paris, 184-149. **Vallet de Viriville*, Procès, etc., Paris. 1867. (Tr.)

many causes contributed, but it may be ascribed chiefly to the disorders occasioned by the schism and the vast wealth of the monasteries, a great portion of which was accumulated between the years 1347 and 1350, when the Black Plague was desolating Europe, and people, in anticipation of death, bequeathed their property to the monks. As a consequence, the domestic life of monasteries underwent a complete change. Charity, wisdom, industry, and the love of science, which had formerly flourished in these retreats, were succeeded by luxurious living and relaxation of morals—disorders from which even female convents were not wholly exempt.

Nicholas de Clemange, sometimes more declamatory than truthful, has left the following startling account of the existing condition of affairs. "We might," he says, "use hard words of monks and nuns were we not restrained by fear of giving scandal. By their vows they have laid upon themselves the duty of being the most exemplary of the Church's children—of cutting themselves off entirely from the world and its concerns, and giving themselves up wholly to a life of contemplation; yes, this is what they should be, but, unfortunately, they are exactly the reverse. They are the most sordid and the most ambitious of human kind. Instead of shunning the world, they seek it, and nothing is more repulsive to them than their cell and their cloister, reading and prayer, their Rule and their religious life."[1]

But, on the other hand, the Mendicant Orders present quite a different spectacle. Leading an active and self-sacrificing life, they also devoted themselves with enthusiastic ardour to scholastic studies, thus meriting and receiving the respect of all classes. The quarrel between the Franciscans and Dominicans grew daily less bitter, and was almost entirely forgotten when the two Orders entered upon two separate and wholly distinct spheres of action. The children of St. Dominic assumed the special office of defending Catholic doctrine against the attacks of heretics, and those of St. Francis devoted themselves chiefly to the work of comforting and serving the people. Among the latter, the *Spiritualists*, whom John XXII. pursued with relentless severity (1318), were the only element of disturbance. A party of them, led astray by *William Ockham*, under their general, *Michael of Cesena*, took sides against the Pope with the Emperor Louis the Bavarian; but, after the death of that prince, they were reconciled to the Church in the Council of Constance.[2] They were shortly approved as a branch of the Franciscan family, under the name of the *Brethren of the Strict Observance* (*Fratres regularis observantiæ*,) and consequently obtained more ample favours than even the *Conventualists* (*Fratres conventuales*). The stubborn adherence of these Orders to the degenerate Scholasticism of that age, and their intemperate zeal in branding the humanist or classical studies, so ardently pursued during the second half of the fifteenth century, as heretical,

[1] *Nicol. de Clemangis*, De ruina eccl., c. 41 (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., Pt. III., p. 33)
[2] Sess. XIX., in *v. d. Hardt*, Conc. Const., T. IV., p. 515.

lost them their former prestige, and exposed them to the taunts and ironical flings of contemporary satirists.

§ 290. *Reform of the Older Orders.*

Cf. *Joan. Busch*, De reformatione et visitat. monasterior., ed. *Leibnitz* (Scriptor. Brunsvicens., T. II.) **Pius Gams*, O.S.B., in Moehler's Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 607 "Reformed Benedictines."

The desire, so frequently expressed by councils, of seeing a reform in the head and members of the Church, naturally directed attention to the notorious *relaxation of discipline in the monasteries*. The *Council of Constance* ordered the Benedictines of Germany to hold a Provincial Chapter,[1] and the precedent thus set was approved and acted upon in many other countries. The *Council of Basle* took still more decided steps in the same direction, and Cardinal *Nicholas de Cusa*,[2] as papal legate, laboured effectively in the cause of reform in Germany. The great source of evil and disorder in the monasteries was the practice of dividing and parcelling out the property of the community among individual monks. Energy and decision were requisite to correct this abuse, but they were, as they will always be when properly employed, effective in spite of the opposition of guilty and interested parties. Moreover, there were many generous, self-sacrificing souls among the monks, who were uncompromising in denouncing the disorders of their more worldly brethren. *John Dederoth* (of Minden) introduced a reform into the Benedictine monastery of *Bursfeld*, near Gottingen, obliging the monks to a stricter observance of their Rule and to a life more in conformity with the spirit of their great founder; and to this *well-regulated* house many other monasteries of the same Order allied themselves.

When this great reformer died (1439), his work was taken up and carried to a successful issue by his successor, *John von Hagen* (1439-1469), whom the papal legates, *John Busch* and *Paul*, had fully imbued with their own spirit and sentiments. Pope Pius II. was filled with joy when he heard of the exemplary condition of the Bursfeld monastery, and, in gratitude, conferred upon the house many rights and immunities.[3]

The houses of the Mendicant Orders, the last to yield to the prevailing relaxation of discipline and decline of morals, and whose devotion to scientific studies had long secured them a high place in public esteem, also underwent a reform.[4] The Council of Constance, in the hope of stimulating all branches of the Franciscan family to generous endeavour, expressed its preference for the stricter party of

[1] Conf. *Trithemii*, Chron. Hirsaugiense ad a. 1417, T. II., p. 346 sq. The Acts, *v. d. Hardt*, Conc. Const., T. I., p. 1086. Conf. *Mansi*, T. XXVIII., p. 1037.

[2] *Scharpf*, Vol. I., p. 156 sq. *Dux*, Vol. II.

[3] Cf. *Leuckfeld*, Antiquitates Bursfeldenses, or History of the former monastery Bursfelde, Lps., 1713. †**Evelt*, The Beginning of the Congr. of Bursfeld-Benedictines, with a special regard to Westphalia, Münster, 1865. *Seiters*, in the *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. II., p. 221-223; French transl., Vol. 3, p. 387.

[4] *Nicol de Clemangis*, De ruina eccl., c. 3[5] (*v. d. Hardt*, T. I., Pt. III., p. 33).

the *Conventualists*;[1] but, unfortunately, this appeal to their better nature, to their duty and sense of honour, was received in a spirit of cold indifference.

§ 291. *New Orders.*

Spiritual life, even in the worst seasons, never entirely dies out in the Church. When wants are felt, new Orders spring into life to supply them, and fresh energies are put into action.

The Order of *Olivetans*, or *Brethren of St. Mary of Mount Olivet* (*Congregatio Sanctæ Mariæ Montis Oliveti*), was founded in 1313, by *John Tolomei* of Siena, a distinguished professor of philosophy in his native city, in gratitude for the miraculous restoration of his sight. In company with a few companions, he established himself in a solitary olive-orchard, near Siena, obtained the approbation of John XXII. for his congregation, and, at the command of the latter, adopted the Rule of St. Benedict.[2]

The *Jesuates*,[3] so called from their custom of incessantly crying through the streets, "*Praised be Jesus Christ*," were founded by *John Colombino*, also a native of Siena. He was so fascinated by the lives of the Saints, particularly that of *St. Mary of Egypt*, that he resigned the highest civil preferment the State could offer, to give himself wholly to the service of the poor and the sick. *Urban V.*, on quitting Avignon to return to Rome, in 1367, approved the new congregation as a community of lay brothers, classed them among the Mendicant Orders, and ordered them to adopt the Rule of St. Augustine. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, permission was given to the Jesuates to take priests' orders; but the congregation was suppressed shortly after by Clement IX., because some of the houses of the wealthy *Padri dell' acqua vite*, as they were called, engaged in the business of distilling liquors and practising pharmacy (1668).

A number of solitaries residing among the mountains of Spain, Portugal, and Italy gradually formed into a community, and called themselves *Hieronymites*,[4] either because they had compiled their Rule from the writings of St. Jerome, or because, adopting the Rule of St. Augustine, they had taken St. Jerome for their patron. Their first superior in Spain was *Peter Ferdinand Pecha*, chamberlain to Peter the Cruel. The community was approved by Gregory XI., in 1374. The famous monastery of Our Lady of Guadaloupe, in Estremadura; the magnificent Escurial, with its wealth of literary treasures, and the monastery of *St. Just*, where Charles V. sought an asylum in the decline of his life, attest their wonderful energy and zeal. The community was first introduced into Italy by *Peter Gambacorta* (*Petrus*

[1] In *v. d. Hardt*, Conc. Const., T. IV., p. 515 sq.

[2] Cf. *Raynald.*, Ad a. 1320, nr. 50. *Helyot*, L. c., Vol. VI., ch. 24, p. 225 sq. *Holsten-Brockie*, T. V., p. 1 sq.

[3] *Bolland*, Acta SS. mens. Jul., T. V. II., p. 333 sq. *Helyot*, Vol. III., c. 55, p. 484 sq. *Poesl*, Life of St. Colomb. of Siena, Ratisb., 1846.

[4] *Holsten.-Brockie*, T. III., p. 43; T. VI., p. 1 sq. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. I., p. 405 sq.

de Pisis.) In the beginning, they took only two simple vows; but Pope Pius V., in 1568, ordered them to take solemn vows.

St. Bridget,[1] a descendant of the royal house of Sweden, while still fulfilling the duties of wife and mother, had affiliated herself to the Third Order of St. Francis, and, after the death of her husband, received divine *revelations*, which Gerson vehemently attacked, and the pontiffs, Gregory XI. and Urban VI., and the councils of Basle and Constance approved.

In one of these revelations she was instructed by Our Lord to found a new Order, and accordingly built a monastery at *Wadstena*, in 1363. The Order was approved by Pope Urban V., in 1370, under the name of the *Order of St. Bridget, or Our Saviour* (*Ordo Stæ Birgittæ seu Salvatoris*), and became, for the countries of Northern Europe, an abundant source of graces and blessings († 1373.) Every house of the Order recognized the supreme authority of the abbey of Wadstena, into which only sixty religious were received, whose spiritual care was intrusted to three priests and four deacons, while ten lay brothers looked after their temporal affairs. The whole number of monasteries corresponded to that of the thirteen (including Paul), Apostles and seventy-two disciples.

Finally, *Francis de Paula*,[2] a native of the little town of Paula, in Calabria, was also the founder of an Order. Impelled by a holy rashness, he sought to follow Our Lord in his poverty more closely than did the children of St. Francis, and retiring into solitude, in the neighbourhood of his native town, he so macerated his body that he was oblivious of all that was going on about him, and strange to say his countenance was withal fresh and cheerful.

In 1457, and succeeding years, he gathered about him a number of followers, fired with his own zeal and love of suffering, who, surpassing even the Minorites in the rigour of their penances, called themselves *Minims*. The heavenly piety of these monks, their angelic purity, and the miracles of their founder, raised their reputation so high, that they spread rapidly through Italy, France, and Spain, particularly after the Order had been approved by Sixtus IV., in 1474 (*Ordo Minimorum fratrum Eremitarum, fratrum Francisci de Paula*.) In the course of a journey to France, undertaken by Francis for the purpose of attending at the death-bed of Louis XI., he was everywhere received with triumphal honours, and everywhere left behind him tokens of his virtue and gift of healing. He predicted the king's death, saying: "Set thy house in order, for thou wilt die and not live." Leo X. completed the joy of the Minims by canonising, in 1519, their holy founder, St. Francis, who died in 1507. The principal house of the

[1] *Brigittæ* revelationes, ed. Turrecremata, Lub., 1492, Rom., 1628. The Life of St. Bridget (*Vaslovii*, Vitis Aquilonia s. Vitæ SS. in Scandinavia, Col., 1623 f. c. notis *Erici-Benzel.*, Upsal., 1708. *Clarus*, The Life and Revelations of St. Bridget, 1856, 4 vols. The Life of St. Bridget of Sweden, by a Religieuse of the Perp. Adoration, Mentz, 1875. The Rule, in *Holst.*, T. III., p. 100 sq. *Helyot*, Vol. IV., ch. iv., p. 29 sq.

[2] *Bolland.*, Acta SS. mens. Apr., T. I., p. 103 sq.

Order, in Rome, is at Sant' Andrea delle Fratte ; there is also another called San Francesco di Paola, adjoining San Pietro in Vincoli.

§ 292. *Independent Associations.*

When treating of the preceding epoch, we traced the origin and rise of the Beghards and Beguines (§ 250), whose heretical opinions and erratic lives exposed them to persecution in the present. Still, these independent associations found favour in Germany and the Low Countries; and as their influence upon society was highly beneficial, they received, after being organized on a new basis and in a more perfect form, the approbation of the Church. *Gerard Groot of Deventer* († 1384), who had had a large experience, and well understood the needs of his eminently practical countrymen, established an independent association of the clergy in Holland, known as the *Clergy and Brethren of the Common Life* (*Clerici et fratres vitæ communis*). He had been educated at Paris, had lectured on theology with distinguished success at Cologne, and finally obtained important ecclesiastical benefices;[1] but, wearying of the worldliness he saw everywhere about him, he began to lead a more austere, though not less active life. His experience as a preacher of penance had made him familiar with the needs of the people and the poverty of the clergy, and to provide for both he dedicated his entire fortune, which was considerable, to the foundation of an institute, whose members were to be, in a special sense, the imitators of the Apostles, earning their bread by the labour of their hands, and teaching holiness of life by lesson and example. The monastery of the *canons regular* at *Windesheim*, founded in 1386 by *Florence Radewijes*, became the headquarters of these associations, which, in the manner of the Beghards and Beguines, included among their members lay persons of both sexes, and existed in considerable numbers in the Low Countries and Westphalia. In the latter country, the members prudently introduced among their exercises scientific, and especially *philological* studies; and it is worthy of note that *Thomas à Kempis* and *Gabriel Biel*, the last of the sententiaries, were of their number. The better classes of the clergy, to escape the contagion of the prevalent disorders, sought refuge in these spiritual confraternities, to which numerous privileges were granted by Popes Eugene IV. and Paul II.

§ 293. *Worship during this Epoch* (1073-1517).

Ivo Carnot, see heading of § 201. *Ruperti Tuitiens.*, De divinis officiis, lib. XII.; **Guil. Durandi*, Episc. Mimatens. (better, *Duranti*, † 1296) Rationale divinor. officior., lib. VIII., many edit., and Ven., 1609, 4to. The general works of *Mamachi*, *Selvaggio*, *Pelliccia*, *Martene*, De antiquis eccl. ritibus, and *Binterim*, Memorab., Vol. V., Pt. I.

The tendency and elevation imparted to the Church by Gregory VII., in her external relations, were not without their influence upon

[1] His Life of Thomas à Kempis (Opp. ed. Sommalius, Antv., 1607, 4to, p. 765). Chronicon collegii Windeshemensis, ed. *Rosweyd*, lib. I., c. 3. *Joan. Busch.* De origine

her interior life, and, as a consequence, worship assumed a more imposing, impressive, and mysterious character. After the crusaders returned from the East, where they had had an opportunity of admiring the temples of Greece and Asia, they were desirous of producing something comparable or superior to them. Moreover, the great bulk of the people were ardently attached to the *feasts of the Church*. From a long catalogue of them, drawn up, in 1229, by the Council of Toulouse, and a still longer one by the Council of Oxford,[1] in 1222, we learn that, in those days, about one-fourth of the year was dedicated to the service of God; and yet, strange to say, we hear nothing of the famine and misery of which modern political economists have, or pretend to have, so much dread, if a few days be set apart in honour of Him who is the Lord of all.

In this, as in every previous and succeeding age, the *Sacrament of the Altar* was the source of religious inspiration, the object of religious enthusiasm, and the sun in the firmament of Catholic worship. "Here," says Innocent III.,[2] "all is mystery; from this source a heavenly sweetness goes forth. Three languages are used in the Mass (Latin, which is the ordinary language; Greek, in the words κύριε ἐλέησον; ἅγιος, ἀθάνατος; and Hebrew, in the words Allelujah, Hosanna, and Amen), that the Father may be honoured in the acknowledgment of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and to recall the three languages in which the title on the Cross was written."

The greatest thinkers of every age have given their best energies to the consideration of this Mystery, and the first masters of spiritual life have strenuously exerted themselves to excite the proper sentiments in those who partake of It. The *elevation* of the consecrated Host, first introduced as a protest against the heresy of Berengarius, now became general; and the practice of ringing a small bell to call attention to the act, derives its origin from Cologne, where it was introduced by the authority of the papal legate, Guido, who also directed that the presence of the Blessed Sacrament should be indicated by the same sign when It was being carried to the sick.[3]

cœnobii et congregat. Windeshemensis. — *Delprat*, over de Broederschap van G. Groot Utrecht, 1830; Arnheim, 1856; transl. by Dr. *Mohnike*, Lps., 1840. Cf. *Ullmann*, John Wessel, Hambg. (1834), 1842, Append. I.

[1] Cf. *Harduin*, T. VII., pp. 180 and 117; *Mansi*, T. XXIII. Cf. also T. XXVI. p. 417; and, finally, *Durandi* Rationale, lib. VII., c. 7. *Binterim*, Hist. of German councils, Vol. VI., p. 534 sq.

[2] *Innocent III.* composed on the Eucharist a work very remarkable for those times, and having for its object the explanation of the ceremonies of the Mass. It bears the title, "Mysteriorum missæ," lib. VI. (Germ. by *Hurter*, Schaffh., 1845); a second ed. appeared later on.

[3] *Cæsarius Heisterbacensis* said about 1225 (De Miraculis et visionib. sui temp. dialog., lib. IX., c. 51): "Tempore schismatis inter Philippum et Othon. dominus Wido Cardinalis—cum missus fuisset Coloniam (a. 1203) ad confirmandam electionem Othonis, bonam illic consuetudinem instituit: præcepit enim, ut ad elevationem Hostiæ omnis populus in ecclesia ad sonitum nolæ veniam peteret, sicque usque ad calicis benedictionem prostratus jaceret. Præcepit etiam idem Cardinalis, ut quoties deferendum esset ad infirmum, scholaris sive campanarius sacerdotem præcedens per nolam illud proderet, sicque omnis populus tam in stratis quam in domibus Christum adoraret." Honorius III. made this a positive law (Decretal. Greg., lib. III., tit. XLI., c. 10).

Tabernacles, *monstrances* (*ostensoria*), and *pyxes*, for preserving, exposing, and carrying the Blessed Sacrament, also came into general use about this time.

All the arts vied with each other in celebrating the Blessed Sacrament; paintings the most perfect and hymns the most divine, inspirations of Christian genius and love, were laid upon the altar by the gifted and noble sons of the Church. In Spain, in Bohemia, and in Poland, thanks to the exertions of Gregory VII., the Mozarabic and Slavic liturgies were replaced by the Roman, which was regarded as a public sign and symbol of that union which every church must have with the See of St. Peter.[1]

Even in the preceding epoch, a fear, arising from feelings of profound reverence towards the Blessed Sacrament, began to be entertained that the general use of the chalice might be the occasion of accidents saddening to every pious soul. These feelings deepened and became more general as time went on, and were strengthened by the teachings of the most eminent of the Schoolmen, who held that the Body of our Lord was wholly contained under *either species*, and that, as a consequence, the faithful, in receiving the Body, received also the Precious Blood (*concomitantia corporis et sanguinis*). From this time forth the ancient usage was gradually discontinued.*

[1] *Gregor.* VII. ep., lib. VII., ep. 11 (*Harduin*, T. VI., Pt. I., p. 1434). On the reproaches made to the popes with respect to their efforts to improve public worship, see the *Tübing. Quart.*, 1844, nro. 4.

* *Alexand. Halesius* (in Sent., lib. IV., quæst. 53, membr. 1) answers the question: Utrum liceat sumere corpus Christi sub specie panis tantum, etc.: "Dicendum, quod quia Christus integre sumitur sub utraque specie, bene licet sumere corpus Christi sub specie panis tantum, sicut fere ubique fit a laicis in Ecclesia." The chief objection urged against withholding the chalice, claims that the Body of our Lord is present sub specie vini, non sacramentaliter, sed tantum ex unione naturali, and therefore communion *sub una specie* seemed to be imperfect; but *St. Thomas Aquinas* replaced the words, *unio naturalis*, of Albertus M., by those of *concomitantia realis* s. *naturalis*. *St. Bonaventure* is still more explicit. The former says, in his Summa, Pt. III., qu. 76, art. 1: "Omnino necesse est confiteri secundum fidem cathol., quod totus Christus (i. e. divinitas, anima et corpus) si in sacramento. Sciendum tamen, quod aliquid Christi est in hoc sacramento dupliciter uno modo quasi ex vi sacramenti, alio modo ex naturali concomitantia. Ex vi quidem sacramenti est sub speciebus hujus sacramenti id, in quod directe convertitur substantia panis et vini præexistens, prout significatur per verba formæ, quæ sunt efficativa in hoc sacramento: — ex naturali autem concomitantia est in hoc sacramento illud, quod realiter est conjunctum ei, in quod prædicta conversio terminatur. Si enim aliqua duo sunt realiter conjuncta, ubicumque est unum realiter, oportet et aliud esse. Artic. 2: Sub utraque specie sacramenti totus est Christus, aliter tamen et aliter. Nam sub speciebus panis est quidem corpus Christi ex vi sacramenti, sanguis autem ex reali concomitantia, sicut supra dictum est de anima et divinitate Christi. Sub speciebus vero vini est quidem sanguis Christi ex vi sacramenti: corpus autem Christi ex reali concomitantia." Cf. quæst. 80, art. 12. And by *Bonaventure* in Sent. lib. IV., dist. II., Pt. II., art. I., qu. 2, the question—An utraque species sit de integritate sacramenti—is thus answered: "Esse de integritate Sacramenti *dupliciter* est: aut quantum ad efficaciam, et sic neutra species est de integritate, sed quælibet est totum, quod habet efficaciam: aut quantum ad signationem vel significationem, et sic sunt de integritate, quia in neutra per se exprimitur res hujus sacramenti, sed in utraque simul. — Ideo fideles recipiunt perfectum sacramentum sub una specie, quia ad efficaciam recipiunt. Sed quantum ad significantiam sufficit, quod Ecclesia facit in eorum præsentia, nec oportet, quod ipsi recipiant, propter periculum effusionis et propter periculum erroris, quia non crederent simplices in alterutra specie totum Christum recipere."

Robert, Bishop of Liege, was the first to give full expression to the profound and universal sentiment of devotion towards the adorable Sacrament of the Altar, by instituting, in 1246, a special feast in its honour (*Festum Corporis Christi*). The occasion of this action was a vision of the nun, *Juliana of Retinna*, in which she beheld the moon shining with brilliant effulgence, but darkened in one spot, which, she said, denoted the absence of a feast specially dedicated to the Blessed Sacrament, and shut out much light from the Church.[1] A circumstance equally strange led Pope Urban IV. to give his approbation to the feast. In 1264, while a priest was celebrating *Mass in Bolsena*, near Orvieto, some drops of the consecrated wine accidentally fell upon the corporal. The celebrant, desirous of concealing the negligence from those about him, folded the linen corporal several times, but the Sacred Species, passing through all the folds, left a blood-stain on each. The corporal may still be seen at Orvieto, where it is preserved, and the circumstance itself has been made the subject of one of Raphael's pictures in the "Stanze" of the Vatican. In 1311, the Œcumenical Council of Vienne extended the feast to the whole Church, with the remark, however, that Holy Thursday, being within a season of mourning, was not a fit day to celebrate it.[2] The feast called forth all the pomp and splendour of the Church's ritual, and, to contribute to its worthy celebration, St. Thomas Aquinas wrote the incomparable office, *Sacerdos magnus*, and the equally incomparable hymns, *Pange lingua*, *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, *Adoro te devote latens deitas*, and *O esca viatorum*. Moreover, apart from being a direct expression of faith and love, this feast, so dear to every Catholic heart, was also, by the outward and visible recognition of the Real Presence, a pointed protest, and an evidence of a reaction, against the various sectaries who denied the dogma. The practice of carrying the Blessed Sacrament about in processions subsequently became so general that it was found necessary to place it under certain restrictions.[3]

The feast of the *Immaculate Conception* was also instituted about this time. It was first celebrated, in 1140, by the canons of Lyons, who, acting without ecclesiastical sanction, were rebuked by St. Bernard. Through the exertions of the Franciscans it was rapidly introduced among the people, by whom it was joyfully received. The Dominicans in a body[4] assailed the doctrine, and the controversy

[1] *Barthol. Fisen*, Origo prima festi corp. Chr. ex viso virgini Julianæ divinitus oblato, Leod., 1619, 8vo. Cf. *Bzovii*, Annal. eccl. a. 1230, nr. 16. Acta SS. ed. *Bolland.* m. April, T. I., p. 437 sq. *Mansi*, T. XXIII., p. 1077. Bullarium magn. Roman. ed., Lugd., 1712, T. I., p. 146. *Binterim*, Memorab., Vol. V., Pt. I., p. 275. *Bartholet*, Hist. of the Establishment of the Feast of Corpus Christi, together with the Life of Juliana. Transl. from the Fr. into Germ. by *Vecqueray*, Coblenz, 1847.

[2] Cf. *Raynald.*, Continuat. annal. Baron. ad an. 1264, nro. 26; *Benedict.* XIV. Commentar. de festis Domini Jes. Chr., T. I., p. 212; *Schröckh*, Ch. H., Pt. XXVIII., p. 79 sq., incorrectly gives the cathedral of Civita Vecchia in place of that of Orvieto.

[3] Cf. *Binterim*, Hist. of Germ. Counc., Vol. VII., p. 531 sq.

[4] Dr. *Alzog* says that St. Thomas also attacked this doctrine: a statement which we have disproved on a preceding page (p. 53, Rem., Vol. 2). (Tr.)

between the two Orders, gaining in acrimony and intensity as time went on, called eventually for the interposition of papal authority.[1] This deep and pervading tendency to honour the Blessed Virgin found expression in still another feast, namely, the *Visitation*, which St. Bonaventure has the honour of instituting, and *Urban VI.*[2] extended to the whole Church in 1389. Finally, the inhabitants of *Loreto*, near Ancona,[3] and of *Zell*, in Styria, with a view to perpetuating holy traditions, and to give expression to their grateful love, erected magnificent basilicas in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

About this time, also, was introduced the feast of the *Most Blessed Trinity* (*festum SS. Trinitatis*), or the last of the ecclesiastical year, whose origin, unlike that of all other feasts, is immediately connected with no historical fact,[4] and seems to have been the outgrowth of cumulative religious conviction and feeling. In preceding ages, this underlying truth of Christianity, recalled by every ceremony of the Church, constantly reiterated at the close of every prayer, and specially consecrated by the sanctification of Sunday and the celebration of the great feasts throughout the year, did not seem to stand in need of any explicit recognition or solemnisation; but from the twelfth century onward, particular churches—notably those of Liége and Arles—began to give distinct prominence to the mystery of the Trinity as the complement and crowning expression of *the three chief Christian feasts*, and as being intimately connected with that of Pentecost. Once brought distinctly before the faithful, it rapidly grew in favour, and was extended to the whole Church in 1334, as a feast of second rank (*festum secundæ classis*) by Pope John XXII. *Boniface VIII.* raised the feasts of apostles, evangelists, and of SS. Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great, the four great doctors of the Church, to the rank of what are known in ecclesiastical language, as doubles (*festa duplicia*).

The feast of the *Transfiguration of our Lord*, August 6th (μεταμόρφοσις τοῦ κυρίου), was in the West only a *festum chori*, or one observed by the clergy of chapters; while in the East it was one of the twelve great feasts of the year, a *festum fori*, or one of obligation. *Potho Prun*, a monk of the twelfth century, expresses his astonishment that such a feast should ever have been instituted. It has been celebrated in the Western Church since the year 1457, when it was

[1] *Bernardi*, Ep. 174, ad Canonicos Lugdun. The quarrel between the two Orders gained in importance when the Council of Basle declared in its thirty-sixth session: "Immaculatam conceptionem B. M. V. tanquam piam et consonam cultui ecclesiastico, fidei catholicæ, rectæ rationi et sacræ scripturæ, ab omnibus Catholicis approbandam, tenendam et amplectendam. (*Harduin*, T. VIII., p. 1266). The question was still discussed during the following Period.

[2] Cf. *Bzovii*, Ann. ad a. 1389, nr. 2. Cf. *Binterim*, in L. c.

[3] *Horatius Turselinus*, Lauretanæ hist. libb. V., Rom., 1597, and oftener.

[4] *Baluz*, Papæ Aven., T. I., p. 177; cf. not., p. 793. *Benedict* XIV., De festis Christi, et Mariæ, lib. I., c. 13 (opp. T. X., p. 360). *Launoi*, Hist. acad. Navar. II., p 473. Cf. *Bonn Periodical*, nro. 13, p. 133 sq.

formally established by Calixtus III. in thanksgiving for the victory gained over the Turks near Belgrade in 1456.[1]

The pomp and splendour of the ceremonial employed in the celebration of these feasts were greatly enhanced by the glorious *hymns* of the gifted sons of the Church, which, while adding to the collection of former ages, were among the proudest triumphs of the present.[2] The praises of the name of Jesus were sung in pious and mellifluous language by *St. Bernard*, in his canticle *Jesu dulcis memoria*, and his tender and child-like love of the Blessed Virgin found expression in the hymn *Dilitare, aperire*. *Thomas of Celano* († 1220), a disciple of St. Francis, is the author of the DIES IRÆ, that sublime elegiac dirge of the Church; and another Franciscan, *Jacopona* († 1306), contests with *Innocent III.* the authorship of the *Stabat Mater*, the most beautiful and truthful expression of a pure and holy sorrow that ever human mind conceived.

A new feature was now introduced into the hymnology of the Church, due chiefly to the influence of confraternities. While the Latin hymns were still retained in the general liturgy, and sung, on the greater feasts, side by side with them, sprung up in the Church of almost every nation, a national church-song in the vulgar tongue, consisting partly of translations of Latin hymns and partly of original productions. In Germany, however, compositions of this character may be traced back all the way to St. Boniface. They became more numerous in the twelfth century, and it is evident, from a document bearing the date of 1323, that hymns were sung in the vulgar tongue, during divine service, in Bavaria.[3] Nearly contemporaneously with the invention of the art of printing appeared many collections of hymns translated from the Latin, and German canticles and popular songs, which are still extant.

As prayer-books had not yet come into general use, their place was supplied by the *Rosary*, which was connected by the Dominicans with the main facts of Christian faith, *the mysteries of Redemption*, and with the *glories of the Mother of God*.[4] After the great victory of *Lepanto* (October 7, 1571), gained by Don Juan of Austria, on the very day

[1] *Potho*, De statu dom. Dei, l. 3. *Raynald.*, ad an. 1457, nro. 23. *Freiburg* Cyclopædia, Vol. XI., p. 129. French transl., Vol. 24, p. 27. (TR.)

[2] Cf. *Daniel*, Thesaurus hymnologicus sive hymnor. canticor. sequentium circa a. 1500 usitatorum, etc., Hal., 1841, sq., T. I. (hymni), T. II. (sequent. cant. antiphonæ), and the collections of ecclesiastical hymns, by †*Mohne*. *Schlosser*, quoted on p. 786, note 4. *Simrock*, Lauda Sion, Cologne, 1850. †*G. Morel*, Lat. hymns of the M. A., Our Lady of Hermits, 1866.

[3] *Hoffmann*, Hist. of German church-song before Luther, Breslau, 1832; 2 ed., Hanover, 1854. *Wackernagel*, German church-song, from the most ancient times to the seventeenth century, Lps., 1863. *Hoelscher*, German church-singing before the Reformation, together with ancient melodies, Münster, 1849. †*Kehrein*, Church-songs, hymns, and psalms from the most ancient printed Song and Prayer-books, Würzburg, 1859, sq., 3 vols. †*Meister*, The German Catholic Church-singing, together with the melodies, Freiburg, 1862. For Poland, *Oloff*, Hist. of song in Poland, in his Essays on the political, ecclesiastical, and literary History of Poland, Danzig, 1764, 2 pts.

[4] Cf. the bibliography given above, p. 287, note 2, Vol. 2, and Manual of the devotion of the Rosary, transl. from the French into Germ. by *Axinger*, Augsburg, 1843.

that the *confraternities of the Rosary* were going round on pilgrimages, and performing special devotions in Rome, to propitiate the God of battles in favour of the Christians, *Pius V.* formally established the *feast of the Holy Rosary.* The day for its celebration was fixed on the first Sunday of October by *Gregory XIII.*, and *Clement XI.* extended it to the whole Church.

Those ceremonial and other provisions, tending to heighten the effect of public worship and increase its efficiency, were supplemented by instructive and earnest *sermons,* which still further promoted its utility and contributed to keep a living and active faith aglow in the hearts of the faithful.

Richard of St. Victor (C. A. D. 1164), in a sermon delivered on Easter Sunday, said that it was not his intention to instruct his hearers, but simply to recall truths and facts to their minds; because, he added, they knew the teaching of Holy Scripture as well as himself.

At the close of this period (1503), we meet the remarkable statement that "preaching contributes more than anything else to the conversion of man, excites him to penitence, thereby securing pardon of mortal sins, while the Sacrifice of the Mass effaces only venial sins."[1]

Among the most eminent preachers of those times may be reckoned *St. Yves of Chartres, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Hildebert of Mans, Godfrey of Bordeaux, Gilbert de la Porrée, Abelard, St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas Aquinas,* and many more of the Schoolmen, who put aside, for the time, the rigorous forms of the schools, and, while instructing the people, employed language the most simple and the best calculated to convey to their minds a clear and intelligible idea of the matter in hand. The members of the Order of St. Dominic gave their special attention to pulpit eloquence, and one of their number—*John of Vicenza*—rose to the first rank of preachers, a distinction which he might have retained to the close of his life had he not allowed himself to be overcome by the temptation of mingling politics with religion (C. A. D. 1230).

At a still earlier day, *Fulco, curé of Neuilly,* had stirred the heart of the French people to its depths, and roused them to make new exertions and fresh sacrifices to reconquer the Holy Land. In Germany, the Franciscan, *Berthold* († 1272), softened even the hardest hearts, and excited in them feelings of compunction.[2] The biographer of *St. Anthony of Padua,* surnamed the "Ark of the Covenant," says, in speaking of his sermons: "They were flames of fire, impossible to

[1] See *Surgant,* Manuale curatorum. Unfortunately an impartial history of mediæval preaching has still to be written. One can find very interesting information on the subject in the theological controversies of *Daniel,* ch. VIII., p. 73 sq., especially p. 80, note,* against *Guericke;* in Innocent III., Vol. IV., pp. 501-510; in *Schröckh,* Ch. H., Pt. XXIX., pp. 211-330; *Kerker,* in Tübg. Quart., 1862, nro. 2, pp. 267-301, and *Moehler's* Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 71 sq.

[2] *Kling,* Sermons of the Franciscan, Berthold, partly unabridged and partly epitomized Berlin, 1824, new transl. and ed. by †*Göbel,* Schaffhausen, 1851, 2 pts., 2nd ed., 1857. Complete ed. of his sermons, accompanied with annotations and dictionary, by *Pfeiffer,* Vienna, 1862, sq. *Grieshaber,* German sermons of the thirteenth century, Stuttgart. 1844-46, 2 vols.

withstand, which roused numbers of sinners and criminals to penitence."

As was natural in an age when great preachers abounded, there were not wanting directions as to the best method of rendering preaching fruitful in good results. Treatises were written on the subject by *Alanus of Ryssel* and *Abbot Guibert of Nogent* († 1124). The latter requires a preacher to have a pure conscience, an elocution energetic and impetuous, and a plain and familiar speech. Such was the method followed in instructing the people by Humbert, a native of Romans, in the diocese of Vienne, and General of the Dominican Order († 1277). *St. Bonaventure*, in his exposition of the Bible (*Biblia pauperum omnibus prædicatoribus perutilis*), intended to serve as an aid to inexperienced and ignorant preachers of the Word of God, makes war on all tricks and devices resorted to by pulpit speakers for effect, declaring that their one aim and purpose should be to gain souls and give glory to God. The same principles were urged by the Dominican, *John of Runsch*, called *Johannes Friburgensis*.[1]

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, particular districts were blessed above others by the presence of eminent and holy preachers. Such was the effect produced upon his hearers by *John Tauler* († 1361), at Cologne and Strasburg, that contemporary writers own to an inability to convey an idea of it.[2] This humble expounder of the Word of God, having observed, during the early days of his career as a preacher, that the proud consciousness of *his own* ability and his great erudition prevented the truths that he proclaimed from sinking into the hearts of his hearers and bearing fruit, ceased to preach for two years, and during the interval occupied himself in meditating on the life of our Saviour and the practice of self-denial.

Vincent Ferrer, as affable and tender to others as he was harsh and severe to himself, by his eloquent sermons and exemplary life, brought numbers of heretics back to the Church.[3] Such was the wonderful success of his preaching among people of various nationalities, that he was popularly believed to have received the gift of tongues, of which he knew only Spanish and Latin; and his angelic life was so close an imitation of the life of Christ, that, when he came to Vannes, the inhabitants cried out, "*Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.*" He was not in the least elated by his splendid success, was uniformly humble and unassuming, and led a most austere life, not unfrequently scourging himself.

John Capistrano[4] was equally successful in combating the Hussites

[1] *Guibertus*, Liber, quo ordine sermo fieri debeat. *Humbertus de Romanis*, De eruditione prædicator. libb. II. *Johannes Friburgensis*, Summa prædicator, et confessarior., Lugd., 1518, 4to.

[2] Sermons of *John Tauler*, for all the Sundays and festivals of the year (translated into modern book-language, by Schlosser, Frcft., 1826. 3 pts.); ed. by the Protestants *John Arnd* and *James Spener;* new ed. by the Protestant preacher, *Kunze*, and *Dr. Biesenthal*, Berlin, 1841, 3 pts.

[3] *Heller*, St. Vincent Ferrer, Berlin, 1836. *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. IV., pp. 39-41. French transl., Vol. 8, pp. 461-464.

[4] His first biography is by P. *Sedulius* (historia Seraphica); when *Wadding*, in his ann.

in Bohemia. His sermons were delivered in Latin, and then translated and explained by an interpreter, who accompanied him on his journeys. He has also gained a name in profane history by his zealous and efficient labours in preaching a crusade against the Turks.

The fiery energy and resistless eloquence of *Jerome Savonarola*, his apocalyptic imagery and fervid language, subdued all hearts.[1]

Gailer of Kaisersberg had hardly been called to a religious life, before he began to assail with unusual vehemence the follies of the world and the abuses of the Church, particularly in his famous satirical work, entitled *Brand's* Vessel of Fools. According to the very appropriate custom of the age, he was buried under the pulpit of Strasburg minster, the scene of his labours and triumphs († 1510).[2]

This style of preaching was carried to still greater excess by *Gabriel Barletta*, a Neapolitan monk, who flourished about the last quarter of the fifteenth century.[3]

Finally, the German sermons of *Pelbart* (1500), a Franciscan, in spite of many and serious defects of method, were not devoid of that virtue that touches and moves the hearts of men.[4]

The so-called "*Plenaries*, according to the Ordinances of the Holy Christian Church," being German translations of the Gospels, Epistles, and Ordinary of the Mass, to which were added glossaries, homilies, and hymns, first published at Augsburg, in 1480; again at Strasburg, in 1483; at Basle, in 1522, and at many other places, contributed largely to the edification of the people, and, with some improvements, became excellent books of instruction and prayer.[5]

It is still a very common and erroneous belief, that every sort of *biblical* and *catechetical instruction* was wanting in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Of many modes of public religious instruction, one may be instanced by way of correcting this error, viz., *pictorial representations*, which had at this time obtained a very extensive circulation. Previously to the publication of *printed* Bibles, a small book, containing about fifty woodcut prints, and erroneously ascribed to *St. Ansgar* († 865), was put into the hands of the people. It went under the name of "*The Poor Man's Bible*" (*Biblia Pauperum seu historia V. et N. T.*), because, as is obvious, the prints were got up with a view of

ordin. Minor., had published numerous documents, then appeared Capistranus triumphans s. historia fundamental. de St. J. Capistrano, etc., auctore P. F. *Amand. Hermann.* ord. Minor. strictæ observ., Col. 1700, Germ., Munich, 1844. Cf. *Bonn Periodical*, nros. 21 and 22. *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. II., pp. 622-624; French transl., Vol. 4, pp. 3-6.

[1] The list of his sermons is found in *Meier*, L. c., p. 393 sq.; his most remarkable works are: In oration. Domini expositio quadruplex, Par., 1517; Compendio di rivelazioni, Firenze, 1495, 4to, and Flor. et. Par., 1496, 4to; De simplicitate vitæ chr., Flor., 1496, 4to.; **Triumphus crucis*, s. de veritate fidei, Flor., 1497, 4to.

[2] Mirror of the World, or Sermons on the Mad Vessel of Sebastian Brand, Basle, 1574, and oftener; ed. by *Simrock*, in a modern High-German transl., and with many woodcuts, Berlin, 1872. Cf. *Ammon*, Gailer of Kaiserberg's Life, Writings, and Sermons, Erlang., 1826. See several Essays on Gailer in the **Hist. Polit. Papers*, 1861, 1862.

[3] Sermon. quadragesim. Bresc. and other collections of his sermons, Venet., 1577, 2 T.

[4] Cf. *Ammon*, Hist. of Homiletics, Vol. I., p. 353 sq., and the beautiful sermon for Good Friday, epitomised by *Daniel*, L. c., pp. 81-87.

[5] See § 313.

enabling such as were too poor to purchase a manuscript copy of the Bible, to obtain, at a small cost, a tolerably full and accurate knowledge of its contents.

The pictures are very well executed, considering the age in which they appeared, and display a thorough acquaintance with the Sacred Text. Beside the prophecies and types of the Old Testament are placed the events indicating their fulfilment[1] in the New, to which are added biblical texts by way of illustration and explanation.[2]

A "*Pictorial Edition of the Catechism*," on the plan of the Poor Man's Catechism, was edited by *Gefken*, in Hamburg, from the Heidelberg Codex 438. The subject is intelligently treated, and an introduction, giving the reader much valuable information concerning the modes of religious instruction in the fifteenth century, accompanies the work.[3]

§ 294. *Christian Art.*[4]

Vasari Giorgio (Painter and Architect at Florence, † 1474.) Le Vite de' più excellenti Pittori, Scultori, e Architetti. Publicate per cura di una Società di Amatori delle Arti, Belle. Small 8vo, Florence, 1846-54. This is unquestionably the most useful of all the editions of this valuable work on the arts of Italy. The notes are copious, and the principal lives are followed by excellent commentaries. The editors have in this edition embodied not only the labours of all other Italian commentators, but also the researches of the German and some other foreign writers on art—Schorn, Rumohr, Gaye, Förster, and others. The editors are Carlo and Gaetano Milanesi, Carlo Pino, and Padre Vincenzo Marchese. Ed. by Vasari himself, in 3 vols., Florence, 1568. Milan ed. of 1800, in 7 vols. Engl. transl. of Vasari, in 5 vols., by Bohn; Germ. transl. by Schorn, Stuttgart, 1832 sq. *Lanzi*, L'Abate L., Storia Pittorica della Italia dal Risorgimento delle Belle Arti fin presso al fine del XVIII. Secolo, 4th ed., 6 vols., 8vo, Florence, 1822. The principal general work on Italian painting. *Lasinio Cav. Carlo*, Pitture a Fresco del Campo Santo di Pisa, 42 plates f., Florence, 1812 and 1828. A magnificent work, and the most valuable illustration of the early wall-painting of Italy. *Marchese*, Padre L. V., Memorie dei più insigni Pittori, Scultori, e Architetti Domenicani, etc., 2 vols., 8vo, Florence, 1846; transl. into English by the Rev. C. P. Meehan, in 2 vols., Dublin, 1852. *Merrifield*, Mrs., Original Treatises, dating from the twelfth to the eighteenth centuries, on the arts of Painting in Oil, Miniature, Mosaic, and on Glass, 2 vols. 8vo, London, 1849. *Eastlake*, Sir C. L., Materials for a History of Oil Painting, 8vo, London, 1847. *Lindsay*, Lord, Sketches on the Hist. of Christian art, 3 vols., 8vo, London, 1847. *Reynolds*, Sir J., The Discourses, etc., London, 1842. (Tr.) *Seroux d'Agincourt*, Histoire de l'art par les monuments, Par. et Strasb., 1823, 6 vols.; Germ., Berlin, 1840 sq.; Italian text, Mantua, 1841, 7 vols., f. Le moyen âge monumental et archéologique, avec un texte explicatif, exposant l'histoire de l'art d'après les monumens., Par., 1841. *A. F. Rio*, De l'art chrétieni,

---

[1] The same parallelism was also employed by *Overbeck*, in the marginal drawings to his cartoons of the seven Sacraments. (Tr.)

[2] In the now prevailing scarcity of ancient manuscripts and xylographic copies of such bibles, a new printed edition of the "*Biblia Pauperum*," at Vienna, 1863, and *Zurich*, 1867, with illustrations by *Laib* and *Schwarz*, was a very desirable acquisition. Cf. the Head Librarian, Dr. *Ruland's* Essay on Pictorial Representations as a vehicle of religious popular instruction (*Chilianeum*, Würzburg, 1862, Vol. I.)

[3] *Gefken* (preacher in Hamburg,) The Pictorial Catechism of the fifteenth century, and the principal points of the Catechism during that time until Luther; the ten commandments, with twelve cuts. Lps., 1855, in 4to.

[4] Who can forget to call to mind here the beautiful poem of *Wm. von Schegel* on the alliance between Art and Religion, or the painting of *Overbeck*, representing the same subject? On the relation of art to religion, cf. *Staudenmaier*, The Genius of Christianity as manifested in Holy Lessons, Holy Practices, and Sacred Art, Mentz, 1843, Pt. I., pp. 225-250, 3rd ed. (Tr.)

ed. II., Par., 1865-1867, 4 vols. Il Vaticano descritto ed illustrato da Erasmo *Pistolesi* con Disegni a contorni diretti dal pittore *Camillo Guerra*, 8 magnificent vols. in fol., Rome, 1829-1838. (Tr.) Descrizione de Campidoglio di *Pietro Rhigetti*, 2 superb vols. fol., Rome, 1833-1836. (Tr.) *De Bastard*, Peinture et ornements des manuscrits, classés dans l'ordre chronologique pour servir à l'histoire des arts du dessin depuis le IVe siècle de l'ère chrétienne jusqu' à la fin du XVIe, Paris, 1840 sq. Cf. *l'Artiste*, No. 20, le Moyen âge monumental et archéologique, ou Vues des édifices les plus remarquables de cette époque en Europe, avec un text explicatif, exposant l'histoire de l'art d'après les monuments, Paris, 1841. *Sir Wm. Dugdale*, Monasticon Anglicanum, London, 1655-1661-1673; a new and greatly enlarged ed. by Blandinel, Caley, and Ellis, 1817-1830, and 1846; Mrs. *Anna Jameson*, Memoirs of the early Italian painters, etc., 1845; Sacred and Legendary Art, 2 vols. 8vo, London, 1848. The Scriptural and Legendary History of Our Lord, etc., as represented in Christian Art, 1861. By the *same* authoress, Legends of the Monastic Orders, as represented in the Fine Arts, 8vo, London, 1850, and Legends of the Madonna, etc., 8vo, London, 1852. (Tr.) *Laib* and *Schwarz*, Theory of the forms of the Romanesque and Gothic styles of Architecture, 2nd ed., Stuttg., 1858. *Boisserée*, Monuments of Architecture on the banks of the Lower Rhine, from the seventh to the thirteenth century, Munich (1833)-1842. The *same*, Hist. and description of the Cathedral of Cologne, Stutt., 1828. B.'s Monuments, etc., by Canon *F. Bock*, of Aix-la-Chapelle. *Puttrich*, Architectural Monuments of the M.A. in Saxony, Lps., 1836-1843. *Kugler*, Hand-book of the History of Art, Stuttg. (1842), 3rd ed., 1859 (partially translated into English, viz., the Schools of Painting in Italy, by a Lady, and ed. by Sir *Charles Eastlake*, London, 1851), with atlas by *Guhl* and *Casper*, Stuttg., 1845-54. **Schnaase*, Hist. of the arts of form, Düsseldorf, 1866 sq. Although not as complete in narration as is Kugler's, it yet gives a philosophical and hist. account of the origin of the various styles, and their connection with each other. **Lübke*, Outlines of a Hist. of Art, with illustrations, Stuttg., 1860. *Otte*, Hand-book of the Archæology of Christian Art in Germany during the M. A., 3rd ed., Lps., 1854. *Springer*, Hand-book of the Hist. of Art. †*Dursch*, Æsthetics of the Christian fine arts of the M. A. in Germany, Tübg., 1854. *Rumohr*, C. F. Von, Italian Researches, 3 vols. 8vo, Berlin and Stettin, 1827-31. Very critical. (Tr.) †*Neumaier*, Hist. of Christian Art, Schaffh., 1855, 2 vols. †*Jacob*, Art in the service of the Church, Landsh., 1857. Cf. also *Raumer*, The Hohenstaufens, Vol. VI., p. 524-546. **Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. IV., pp. 652-698.

The grand conceptions of Scholasticism and the practical tendency of Mysticism, as expressed by art, brought the idea of Christianity more fully home to man, and enabled him to penetrate more deeply into its real meaning and tremendous significance. Truth, stripped by intellectual process of the warmth and colour of its surroundings, standing before the mind's eye in its native strength, destitute of the drapery that adds grace and beauty to the form and fills the imagination, shorn by logical methods of every attraction that appeals to sense, may indeed satisfy one of trained intellect, but has no fascination, no charm, and no subduing influence for a mind in which the life of the spirit is constantly in contact with that of the senses, and in which, to reach the former, the approaches must lie mainly through the latter. Such a soul will be loyal to Truth, will give her the devotion of his heart and the service of his senses when she comes to him, retaining indeed all her chaste and severe simplicity, but clad in the varying and graceful robes of art. Once mistress of his heart, she will be his inspiring genius and the guide of his life; for from the heart proceed, and to it return again, as to a centre and source, every human force and agency, whether sensuous or spiritual; from that mysterious life-spring do all the energies, capabilities, and sympathies of man draw their vitality and power. The noble and graceful symbolism, borrowed partly from the works of nature and partly from history,

employed by the Church to present dogmatic truths to the mental vision under living and tangible forms, left an impression on the mind that deepened and took definite shape as time went on, and exercised a fascination on the heart to which even the most obdurate were not insensible.

The Catholic Church, thus faithfully served by her handmaids, Science and Art, could supply, with a never-failing versatility and fecundity, every want of human nature, and satisfy every aspiration of the intellect and all the complex demands of the imagination, the heart, and the senses.

This prolific power was never more manifest than in the age when *Neo-Germanic* architecture—which, since the time of *Vasari*, has been incorrectly called *Gothic*—replaced in the construction of churches the *Byzantine* and *Romanesque* styles hitherto in use. This style, which a modern writer has called *la pensée chrétienne bâtie*, or the architectural expression of Christian thought, spread with wonderful rapidity over France, Germany, England, Spain, and Sicily, but was never received in Italy, whose people, familiar with the style of Roman structures, did not care to admit another, which they believed to be a barbarous creation. Here *Brunelleschi* raised the dome over the cathedral of Florence (after 1431), and *Giotto* built its incomparable belfry; and here, too, *Julius II.* laid, in 1506, the corner-stone of St. Peter's Basilica, designed by *Bramante*. The cathedral of Milan, conceived in the pure Gothic style by *Arrigo da Gamondia* (*Henry Arler of Gmünd*), but executed in the mixed Roman and Gothic style, marks the period of transition from one to the other, and presents the extremes of each. A similar blending of the two styles is also visible in the churches of Santa Maria del Popolo and St. Augustine in Rome. The *pointed arch*, the characteristic of the Gothic style, is symbolical of Christian thought, aspiring heavenward,[1] fixed upon the life to come, carrying one's hopes beyond the grave, and on to the everlasting Jerusalem.[2] Again, the arch, in which the skill of the mason is made subservient to the stone-cutter's higher art, *branching out from the great masses of heavy stone* in which its bases are set, rises away into the *heights* above. The high towers, formerly intended to serve only the purpose of belfries, and standing apart from the main edifice, were afterwards made to coalesce and harmonize with the general architecture, and, by a happy inspiration, became, as it were, the key and crowning glory of the vault. Their beauty and picturesqueness were much enhanced by the rich *pyramidal* shaped crowns of delicate *filigree-like* work, in which the dark and heavy stone was, in a manner, spiritualized, and grew into bright, transparent, and airy forms, as if to perpetually remind man that the more completely he puts off the things of the earth, the more ethereal and spiritual will he become.[3]

[1] Coloss. iii. 1, 2.

[2] *Wiegemann*, On the Origin of the pointed arch, Düsseldorf, 1842. *Reichensperger*, The Chris. Germ. Architecture, Treves, 1845. *Didron*, Ann. arch., 1845.

[3] Whilst the architectures of Greece and Rome, says Card. *Wiseman*, like their religion,

In its general arrangement, the Basilica, the temple of the living God, reposing upon the foundation of Prophets and Apostles, and sustained by Christ, its corner-stone,[1] presented the shape of a *cross*, the symbol and embodiment of all religion, and formed between the nave and choir, a quadrangular space, commemorative of the *four Evangelists;* while its vault was borne up by *twelve columns*, suggestive of the *Twelve Apostles.* The thin walls, too weak to resist the thrust of the vault, were strengthened on the outside by buttresses, which, ornamented with carving and tracery, were sometimes bent into semi-circular arches, and branching out into all sorts of forms,[2] putting forth garlands and clusters of flowers in rich and varied profusion, forcibly reminded one in the fully developed *minster* or *dome*[3] of a petrified grove of oaks or the bewildering view of a grotto filled with countless stalactites and stalagmites.

In Gothic ornamentation the vegetable kingdom played an important part, probably because of the symbolism of the *plant* struggling to free itself from the prison and shackles of earth and to rise towards heaven. The Germans, in whom the memories of the groves sacred to their forefathers[4] had not quite died out, promptly responsive to the influence of nature, unconsciously drew upon this source for their models or ornamentation. Still, the representation of animals

kept their main lines horizontal or parallel with the earth, and carefully avoided breaking this direction, seeking rather its prolongation than any striking elevation, the Christian architecture threw up all its lines, so as to bear the eye to heaven; its tall, tapering, and clustering pillars, while they even added apparent to real height, served as guides and conductors of the sense to the fretted roof, and prevented the recurrence of lines, which could keep its direction along the surface of the earth. Nothing could more strongly mark the contrast between the two religious systems. The minute details of its workmanship, the fretting and carving of its many ornaments, the subdivision of masses into smaller portions, all are in admirable accord with the mental discipline of the time, which subtilized and divided every matter of its inquiry into a cluster of ever-ramifying distinctions. The "dim religious light" that passed through the storied window, and gave a mysterious awe to the cavern-like recesses of the building, excellently became an age passionately fond of mystic lore, and the dimmest twilight of theological learning. Nothing could be more characteristic, nothing more expressive of the religious spirit which ruled those ages, than the architecture which in them arose.

But in Italy, and principally in Rome, it was otherwise. The type of art had been cast in those ages of triumph, and it was not rashly nor easily to be abandoned. She did not receive her art from Christianity, and therefore did not adopt the new and beautiful order. . . . The old basis of the Roman basilica was preserved. . . . But the dome! that truly Christian, sublime conception—that raising of a temple to the God of heaven, far above the earth—this grandest invention of modern architecture, who would have wished *that* to have been given up in St. Peter's, or any other Christian church? Card. *Wiseman* in his first lecture on *Holy Week*, delivered in Rome, 1837. (Tr.)

[1] Ephes. ii. 20; Apoc. xxi. 14.

[2] *Metzger*, Ornaments composed of German plants for the use of the plastic art and for painting, Munich, 1841, and the Cologne Cathedral Gazette of 1843 and 1844.

[3] "*Minster*," from monasterium, designates a *cloister*, or *major*, i. e., a *Cathedral Church;* "*dome*," from domus (dominica), indicates, in a general way, any house of God, but was soon restricted in its application to the bishop's Cathedral-church (ecclesia in *domo*, sc. episcopi, the church at the bishop's dome or palace); subsequently, often synonymous with *minster*. Some explain "*Dom*" as an abridgment of the inscription, customary in larger churches, D. O. M. = Deo Optimo Maximo, reading the three letters *together*, without the periods. Cf. *du Cange* Glossar., s. v. *domus*.

[4] See p. 15, Vol. 2.

frequently occurs and forms a not unimportant feature of the style. Thus beside the vine is the lion, fit emblem of faith; beside the rose stand the pelican and the turtle-dove, emblems of love and meekness; and beside the ivy reposes the dog, suggestive of faithful attachment. Besides these emblems of God's holy kingdom, there are terrible dragons and reptiles of enormous size—images of Satan vanquished—which serve, particularly the former, as supports, pedestals, and water-spouts, thus giving practical expression to the hint of St Augustine: "*Maluit Deus ex malis facere bona, quam nulla mala esse in mundo.*" The very pavement of the temple, which represents the ocean, is alive with figures of dolphins and monsters of the deep.[1] From out the bosom of these mimic waters arise areas of dry land in the form of chapels, while the pillars with which they are studded represent islands, and above all stretches a vast expanse of vaulted ceiling, a faint image of the starry heavens. The three great divisions of sky, land, and water—history in its spiritual sense—are here brought within narrow limits,[2] and over this rejuvenated world hovers the living spirit of Christ, alternately manifesting Himself through the Sacraments, in prayer and holy canticles.

The same depth of religious feeling, the same intelligent discrimination, is apparent in the arrangement of the numerous statues that crowd both the exterior and interior of the basilicas. High up above the doorways stand the princes of the Church, the founders and benefactors of the diocese, and even sovereigns, who regarded their office of defenders of Christendom as their highest privilege and most sacred duty, and who from their elevation have looked down, for ages, upon generation after generation entering the temple of salvation and peace. Under the very portico are martyrs and bishops and virgins, each the pride of some particular church, and all the glory of the Church Universal, recalling, as they do, the triumphs and fruits of grace now receiving their full maturity in heaven. From the vault above look down those whose voice proclaimed the saving Gospel throughout the world, and from north and south, east and west, gathered into one community of saints nations redeemed by the blood of Christ and destined to receive the mysterious deposit of his will, his promises, and his precepts. The *arched* vestibule or hall (Paradise) conducting to the entrance is generally adorned with comprehensive historical clusters representing the Creation, the Redemption, and the terrible scenes of the Resurrection and Last Judgment, that the faithful may be reminded to collect their thoughts before entering the House of God.[3] The *mystical rose* (wheel-window) above the door, emblematic of silence, has a kindred significance, because here all earthly clamour must be hushed.

1 On the floor of *St. Mark's*, in Venice, built in the Byzantine style, are represented in mosaic the virtues which were expected to preserve, and the vices which it was feared would ruin, the Republic. (Tr.)

2 Ps. cxlviii, and Cant. Dan., c. 3.

3 Professor Dr. *Cornel Bock*, The cycle of imagery in the vestibule of the minster of Freiburg, ibid., 1862.

Finally, the *stained-glass windows*, superseding the ancient storied tapestry, pour in a flood of mysterious light beneath the sublime and solemn vault;[1] for it is fitting that a more glorious light than that which is employed in the ordinary avocations of life, should illumine with a glow of heavenly splendour the sanctuary where mysteries the most stupendous and unfathomable are enacted. Here should enter the purest rays of the rising and the richest glories of the setting sun, softened and toned to shades of unearthly beauty by their play upon the gorgeously coloured glass. Artists delighted in introducing into their historical scenes of God's kingdom, in heaven and on earth, the golden rays of morning and the richer and more mysterious hues of evening light. There was that about it that was not of earth—something that seemed a foretaste of heaven, and which, when bathing in its glory the scenes of man's fall, of his resurrection and judgment, gave them an indescribable, awe-inspiring, and lasting effect. In whatever direction the devout worshipper turned his gaze he was everywhere met by representations calculated to keep him in a religious frame of mind, or, if a votary of pleasure, to excite in him pious thoughts and holy aspirations. Statues of saints adorning the tombs of princes and bishops rose in the semblance of life out of the clustered pillars. Statues, paintings, vestments, forms, and symbols spoke to the eye—were veritable books for the learned and illiterate alike, where each might learn his duties to God and his relations to the world to come,[2] and did for all classes what printing did more comprehensively at a later day.

Monasteries were the schools of architects and sculptors, and their children led the way in the construction of grand and imposing basilicas. Fulda and St. Gall were famous for their exertions in this field, and the *Dominican convents* were the congenial homes of Gothic art. As time went on, laymen skilled in the science of building and the mason's art formed themselves into corporations and guilds (brotherhoods of masons and others), for the purpose of preserving and perpetuating their scientific knowledge and the secrets of their craft, and to mutually aid each other in erecting those gigantic structures which have been the wonder and admiration of every age since. Until the twelfth century, churches were everywhere, except in Italy, Spain, and Languedoc, generally constructed of wood, but in the succeeding century an active rivalry sprang up all over Europe—countries, provinces, and cities vieing with the other in erecting new temples marvellous cathedrals, domes, spires, and monuments, such as, in our own age, the most powerful States, backed by their immense wealth

[1] *Hurter*, Vol. IV., p. 673 sq. *Gessert*, Hist. of Glass-staining in Germany and the Netherlands, France, England, Italy, and Spain. Stuttg., 1839.

[2] *Gregory the Great* (Epist., lib. VII., ep. 109) says: "Pictures are the books of those who cannot read; they are not adored, but people see there that which is to be adored." In the magnificent poem, "*Titurel*," the idea of Christian architecture is admirably set forth. Cf. *Boisserée*, Essay on the description of the temple of St. Graal, in the third song of Titurel. Munich, 1835.

of financial resource,[1] could not think of attempting, but which, stimulated by the inspirations of faith, impelled by a generous devotion, and strengthened by co-operative union, single cities and single convents then courageously undertook and triumphantly completed. Faith, and faith alone, could set whole populations in motion and nerve them to great enterprises.

The imposing solemnity of the religious ceremonial which accompanies the placing of a corner-stone or the dedication of a church[2] is an evidence of its potency and an instance in point. A noble religious ardour, a glowing enthusiasm for the advancement of Christian architecture, pervaded Europe from end to end, and set all hands to work. Even in the far North, Archbishop Eystein built at *Drontheim*[3] a cathedral which is the most solid, the most imposing, the most finished monument of the Scandinavian peninsula. In *Germany*, the church which ranks next after those of Our Lady at Treves (commenced 1227, completed 1283), and St. Elizabeth at Marburg (commenced 1255, completed 1283), as a master-piece of Gothic art, is the Cathedral of *Cologne*, that model church[4] (commenced 1248, work suspended 1308, resumed 1824), which, together with those of *Strasburg* and *Freiburg*, forms the majestic Gothic trilogy of the Rhine. The more ancient basilicas of Mentz, Spire, and Worms are venerable specimens of Byzantine style.

Among the splendid examples of Gothic architecture in *France* are the cathedrals of Chartres,[5] dedicated in 1260, after it had been one hundred and fifty years in building; of Rheims (1232), the metropolitan church of the kingdom; of Amiens (1228); of Beauvais (1250); Sainte Chapelle, built by St. Louis (1245-1248); the church of St. Denys, the burial-place of the French kings, and the towers of Notre Dame, commenced in 1163, and completed in 1223.

Of the churches in *Belgium*, the most remarkable is that of (St. Michael and) St. Gudule in Brussels (1226,) and that of Dunes, built by four hundred monks (1214-1262).

Among the best specimens of Gothic in *England* are the cathedral of Salisbury, the most beautiful in the kingdom (1220); one-half of that of York (1227-1260); the choir of Ely (1235); the nave of Durham (1212), and the national Abbey of Westminster (1247); and in *Spain*, the metropolitan churches of Burgos and Toledo, commenced by St. Ferdinand in 1228.[6]

[1] *Prisac*, Construction of churches during the Middle Ages (Cologne Cathedral Gazette, year 1842, nros. 25 and 26). *Hist. Polit. Papers*, Vol. 32.

[2] For detailed descriptions, see *Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. IV., p. 662 sq. and 697 sq.

[3] *Minutoli*, The cathedral of Drontheim, and the Christian Architecture of the Scandinavian Normans, during the Middle Ages, Berlin, 1853.

[4] After the plans of Master Gerhard; the cathedral of Strasburg after those of Erwin de Steinbach. Cf. †**Fred. Beck*, Hist. of a German stone-mason, Munich, 1834. *Theodor Melas*, Erwin of Steinbach, Hamburg, 1834, 3 pts. *Boisserée*, Hist. and description of the cathedral of Cologne, Stuttg., 1828. *J. Görres*, The cathedral of Cologne and the minster of Strasburg, Ratisb., 1842.

[5] This cathedral was built after the plans of Robert de Coucy.

[6] "Gothic architecture," says *Kraus* (Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 415), "maintained its

The other arts, faithful handmaids and generous rivals, soon commenced to gather about Christian architecture, their elder sister and mistress. *Sculpture* led the way, and, after many feeble attempts, reached, as early as the *thirteenth* century, a marvellous degree of excellence. Then did those graceful forms of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles, the Angels, and Saints, that adorn the interior and exterior of basilicas, start from the shapeless blocks of marble in semblance of life; then, too, were produced those figures of high and mighty lords and their chaste spouses, sleeping the sleep of the just on their marble couches, their hands folded, and their heads reclining on the knees of angels; or, again, having their numerous family of children gathered about them.

The most beautiful specimens of Gothic sculpture preserved in the cathedrals of Germany, particularly in those of Strasburg and Freiburg; and of France, particularly in those of Notre Dame de Paris, Amiens, and Rouen, both in the reliefs of portals and in detached statues, belong to the interval between 1300 and 1450. The figures of this age disclose an active and highly excited inner life. This is evident from the rising, aspiring attitudes, from the violent bendings and contortions of the body, from the peculiar carriage of the head, and from the broken folds of the cumbersome and heavy drapery. Variety of conception, depth of feeling, and warmth of fervour, are nowhere more visible than in the numerous statues of the Blessed Virgin.

Sculpture was entirely in the hands of seculars. The plastic art was now employed not alone in adorning churches, but also in ornamenting structures destined for profane purposes—such as court-houses, guild-halls, baronial castles, and private dwellings. Still, art did not cease to be mainly devoted to the service of the Church and to the interpretation of Christian ideas; and even those fantastic and ludicrous representations, to be found carved on the arm-rests ("*misericordias*") of many cathedral stalls, are not intended to convey any idea of disrespect to the clergy or to holy things, but simply to show to what the abuse of holy things will lead.

Besides the works in *stone*, we should not omit to mention that many creditable *brass castings* (tombs) and *carvings in wood* (stalls, choirs, and pulpits), and *ivory*, were produced. The plastic art flourished most in *Germany* and *Italy*. *Italian art*, though unable to

ascendancy until the middle of the fourteenth century, when it declined, and decoration, outstepping its proper limits, ceased to be subservient to construction. This style of architecture then lost its essential organic character.

"It was characteristic of *later Gothic* to give an undue prominence to technical details, which were the result of making the construction of the vault independent of the substructure. During the thirteenth century, the vault still retained its cruciform shape, but it was shortly after broken up into a number of vaults, resembling a *network* (*starry* vaults), thus destroying the function of the pillars, which, instead of supporting the vault, were subdivided into parts, whence arose plinths and ribs, serving no perceptible purpose. . . .

"Nevertheless, many of the larger churches, like the cathedral of *Prague;* the church of Our Lady, at Antwerp; of St. Barbara, at Kuttenberg, and the more modern portions of the cathedrals of *Vienna*, *Antwerp*, and *Strasburg*, exhibit architectural excellences of no inconsiderable merit, notably in the construction of spires." (Tr.)

entirely escape Gothic influences, took a very different direction from that of Germany. Even in the thirteenth century, the growing influence of ancient art was perceptible in the works of *Niccolò Pisano;* and from this time forth it became more pronounced, disclosing its presence in the tendency to study living forms and in an assertion of individuality. This is evident in the great works of *Giovanni Pisano* (from 1290), in the duomo of Orvieto; in those of *Giotto* (born 1276, died 1336), in the duomo and *campanile*, or bell-tower, of Florence; in three celebrated bronze doors (1339-1340) of *Andrea Pisano*, and in the two bronze doors of *Ghiberti*, which form the chief ornament of the baptistery of *San Giovanni*, and which Michael Angelo declared were not unworthy of being the gates of Paradise.[1]

Luca della Robbia, a pupil of Ghiberti's, moulded bassi relievi in terra cotta, which he coloured and covered with a durable enamel. His most famous work is the Choir-boys' Practice, in the Cathedral of Florence, in which the attitudes are so natural and the expression so life-like that one is astonished he does not hear the music of their voices. The works of *Donatello*, who is credited with being the restorer of the plastic art in Italy, are destitute of depth of thought and feeling, and, to supply the place of these, he has given to his figures a strained energy of movement. The tomb of St. Sebald, by *Vischer* († 1530), is the most precious art-treasure in the Church of Nürnberg. The grand *tomb of Maximilian*, in the Franciscan Church at Innsbruck, is the work of one of Vischer's pupils.

Painting, in its turn, became the ally of architecture and sculpture, and lent its aid to the work of glorifying God. Taking at once a bold and rapid flight, it produced those master-pieces[2] which are the pride of Italy, and which have never since been equalled. *Pisa* and *Siena* were the cradle, and *Florence* the fostering mother of this art. The first Italian school worthy of the name, and inspired by the true spirit of religious art, consisted of an association of artists under the patronage of St. Luke, and directed by *Guido of Siena* (1221) and *Giunta of Pisa* (1210). It reached a high degree of perfection in *Cimabué* (1240-1303), whose painting of the Annunciation was triumphantly received by the Florentines. All the paintings of this school have a gold ground, are pious and majestic in expression; but the figures are sometimes defective in drawing, portions being immoderately elongated.

Giotto (1276-1337), who was still truer to nature, more successful in delineating its graceful forms and dramatic attitudes, added fresh lustre to his own school, and was the real founder of that of Florence. The same religious ardour, the same sublime enthusiasm, that prompted the noble deeds of St. Francis of Assisi and inspired the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, warmed the heart and spiritualized the thoughts of this artist. His most illustrious pupils were *Taddeo Gaddi*, who com-

[1] Cf. *Kraus*, Ch. Hist., Vol. II., pp. 415, 416. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *Raumer*, Hist. of the Hohenstaufens, Vol. VI., pp. 539-546; *Hurter*, Innocent III., Vol. IV., pp. 674-679.

pleted the Campanile of Florence after his master's design ; *Giovanni da Milano ; Giottino ; Buffalmaco* (1351) who completed the frescoes in the *Campo Santo* (graveyard) of Pisa ; *Orcagna* (c. 1350-1360), whose greatest work, the Last Judgment, is powerful in conception and in the execution of individual figures, but lacking in unity of composition and dramatic power.

Contemporaneously with the School of Giotto were the younger Sienese School, of which the two brothers *Lorenzetti* (1342) were the chief ornaments, and the local schools of Naples, Ancona, Bologna, Milan, Verona, and Venice. A rapid and very marked progress is perceptible in the works of the fifteenth century, the *antico moderno* or *quattrocento* age of art. Foremost among the leaders of this age was Domenico *Ghirlandajo*, who gave greater prominence than any of his predecessors to physical form, making it nearly, if not quite, co-ordinate with spiritual expression.

Fra Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole (b. 1387, † 1455), more conservative in his methods than Ghirlandajo, was one of the most celebrated of the early Florentine painters. He is the best representative of religious painters, and is unsurpassed in the mild, spiritual, and heavenly expression and the beauty of form which are characteristic of all his paintings. A man most sincerely and thoroughly pious, and gifted with a mysterious poetry which pervaded his whole nature, he never commenced painting until after he had first commended himself to God in prayer, and frequently shed tears while engaged at his work. When offered the archbishopric of Florence by Pope Nicholas V., he referred him to *Fra Antonino* as more worthy the honour, and expressed himself content with his little cell, where he painted those wonderful pictures breathing so "heavenly a sweetness."[1]

Masaccio (b. 1402, † 1443) studied nature perhaps more closely than any of his predecessors, and gave special prominence to its *objective* side, thus breaking through the traditionary tendency to take a *subjective* view of everything, and taking the lead in the path to true excellence. "He appears," says Sir Joshua Reynolds (Disc. XII.), "to be the first who discovered the path that leads to every excellence to which the art afterwards arrived, and may therefore be justly considered as one of the great fathers of modern art."

Leonardo da Vinci (b. 1452, † 1519), a man of versatile talents, excelling in sculpture, architecture, painting, music, engineering, and mechanics generally, mathematics, astronomy, botany, and anatomy, in his great painting of the *Last Supper*, in the refectory of the Dominican Convent of Santa Maria delle Grazie at Milan, has solved the problem of all art—the elevation of the natural by the infusion of the spiritual.[2]

[1] The Life of *Fra Giovanni da Fiesole*, O.S.D., according to *Giorgio Vasari*, from the Italian (in Germ.), by Louis Schorn, 1840. *Förster*, the Life and Works of Fiesole, Ratisbon, 1859.

[2] *Rio*, Leonard de Vinci et son école, Paris, 1855 ; see *Hist. Polit. Papers* of the year 1857, Vol. 39, pp. 759-776· *Hefele*, The Last Supper, by Leon. da Vinci (Tübg. Quart. 1867, nro. 1).

Fra Bartolomeo (B. 1469, † 1517) rivalled in prominent relief, handling of light and shade, and delicacy of execution, even Leonardo himself, whose works he studied; and in grouping, composition, and grandeur of conception, some of his paintings are not inferior to those of Raphael. His figures are simple, dignified, and graceful, and the folds of his drapery easy, natural, and striking.

Michael Angelo Buonarotti (B. 1475, † 1564),[1] that universal genius, equally eminent in architecture, sculpture, and painting, and possessing considerable merit as a poet and musician, completely revolutionized art. His style is characterized by sublimity of conception, nobility of form, and ease and breadth of manner. He was evidently quite familiar with the works of *Luca Signorelli*, whose general style he followed closely. There are faults of manner in his figures, which are sometimes too elaborate, and give too much prominence to the display of *muscular* strength and movement—defects from which even his women and children are not wholly exempt. This extraordinary man, the sculptor of *Moses*, in the Church of St. Pietro in Vincoli, a work in which all the terror of the Old Law is vividly expressed; the designer of the *Cartoon of Pisa*, which displays every variety of attitude and action, great anatomical knowledge and admirable skill in foreshortening; the painter of the *Last Judgment* on the altar-wall of the Sistine Chapel, which is unique in the history of art; of the *Creation of the World*, and of *Man*, the *Fall of Man*, and his *Redemption*, on the ceiling of the same chapel, devoted the last days of his restless life, without price or remuneration, to the building of St. Peter's in Rome, of which the four great pillars, the drum, and the double cupola are his work.

Among the most distinguished representatives of the mystic School of Umbria were *Perugino* (1447-1525), *Francesco Francia* (1450-1518), and, pre-eminent above all, *Raphael of Urbino* (1483-1520).[2] The works of Perugino are especially remarkable for purity of sentiment, which lends them an inexpressible charm; but he adhered, to the last, to the formal conventionalities of the *quattrocento* (fifteenth century) style of art.

A striking similarity exists between the early works of *Francia* and those of Perugino. They exhibit the same depth of feeling and purity of sentiment, but are less conventional, less ideal, and more true to nature.

The works of *Raphael*, which are quite numerous, display the characteristics of *three distinct styles*, the first of which is the *Perugino*, the second the *Florentine*, and the third the *Roman*, each having its own merits and indicating the progress of art. In the first, he follows the traditionary school of his master; in the second (fr. 1504), he is eclectic; in the third, first exemplified in his *Heliodorus* (1512), he exhibits the results of his own study, experience, skill, and genius; forms an original style, distinctly and peculiarly his own, in which all

[1] *Condivi, Asc.*, Vita di Michelangiolo Buonarruoti, 4to, Rome, 1553. Ed. *A. F. Gori*, Florence, 1746.

[2] *J. D. Passavant*, Raphael of Urbino, and his father, Giovanni Sanzio, Lps., 1839, in two parts, and with fourteen engravings.

his better qualities are combined in proper co-ordination to each other; body and soul, sentiment and passion, the sensuous and the spiritual, receive each its just degree of prominence; and which, while meriting unqualified approbation, won for him the proud title of *Prince of Artists*. His frescoes in the Vatican Chambers (*Stanze*) are unrivalled among the works of modern painting, though his numerous *charming Madonnas* have perhaps contributed more than all his other productions put together, to his great popularity. His one great aim, in all these works, was to give glory to the Church and to perpetuate the names of Popes Julius II. and Leo X., under whose patronage they were undertaken and executed. His Theology or *Dispute* on the Blessed Sacrament, and his Philosophy or School of Athens, in the Vatican, are both wonderful compositions of a different character—the former being distinguished by vastness of conception, symmetrical figures, and a display of magnificent heads, and the latter by its greater freedom and fulness of form. The Theology, according to *Mr. Ruskin*, is the fullest expression of the Christian idea, and the Philosophy indicates its decline. This incomparable painter, whom the Italians call *Il Divino*, died when precisely thirty-seven years of age, in the full tide of life and vigour of intellectual power; but had he lived longer, he could scarcely have surpassed the Heliodorus, the Madonna di San Sisto, and the cartoons at Hampton Court. He was born at Urbino, April 6, 1483, and died at Rome, April 6, 1520.

While the Umbrian School were embodying the Christian idea in living and breathing forms of unsurpassable excellence, the *Lombard School* were scarcely less assiduously reviving the glories of *ancient art*, which was not without its influence on Raphael, as is evident from his arabesques in the gallery or loggie of the Vatican. Among the chief ornaments of this school were *Giacomo Squarcione* (1394-1474), and *Andrea Mantegna* (1430-1506); and its tendency was to give greater importance to the development of physical beauty and less to religious feelings and the influence of grace, which gave so much charm and fascination to the works of the older schools.

This tendency was still further carried out by *Correggio* (1494-1534) and *Titian* (1477-1576), respectively the founders of the Schools of Parma and Venice. Correggio displayed a wonderful power in producing the most delicate effects of light and shade (*chiaro-oscuro*), and an unapproachable skill in foreshortening. His faces are extremely beautiful, expressive, and full of life; his tints are rich and warm, and exquisitely delicate; his contours easy and graceful, and his draperies natural, and flowing in pleasing lines. But his style did much towards developing the sensuous element in art. Titian, apart from technical qualities, his glowing colour and solid impasto, gives an attractive and dignified representation of the human form; but his is the beauty of fine material development and physical perfection, borrowing nothing from religious thought or devotional feeling. Eminent as an historical landscape, and portrait painter, he was unrivalled in the last-named department of art. The pictures which give the best idea of his

manner in the various periods of his life, are the *Christ of the Tribute-money*, the *Entombment*, and the *Death of Peter Martyr*.

Giovanni Bellini (1426-1516), Caposcuola or Founder of the *quattrocento* School of Venice, besides reaching in colouring, for which this school was pre-eminent, an admirable truth of nature and an ethereal glowing transparency, he was the only one of all the painters of this age who, from the beginning of his career to the end of it, scrupulously adhered to his individual style, and never displayed material beauty at the cost of devotional feeling.[1]

In *Germany*, side by side with the Brotherhood of Stone-masons, schools of painting were founded—first at *Cologne*, on the banks of the Rhine; next at Nürnberg, in *Franconia*, and, still later on, in *Suabia*. *William* (c. 1380) and *Stephen* (c. 1440) were the first two masters of the Cologne School, and the latter is the painter of the celebrated "Cathedral Picture," *Dombild*, representing the Three Wise Men, St. Gereon, and St. Ursula and her companions.

The Flemish School owed its origin to *Christopher* (1471-1501); but in a more special sense to the two brothers, *Hubert* and *John van Eyk* (1366-1470), the latter of whom invented *oil-painting*, thereby realising greater brilliancy and warmth of colouring.[2] The greatest representative of this school was *Hans Hemling*.

The best representative of the Franconian School after the time of *Michael Wohlgemuth*, was the genial and prolific *Albert Dürer* (1471-1528), who, notwithstanding his pronounced sympathy for the Reformation, steadily adhered to the *traditionary ecclesiastical style* of art.

The *Suabian* School, which opened with *Martin Schoen* of Augsburg († 1499), developed more and more its distinctively Christian character in the works of *Bartholomew Zeitblom* of Ulm († 1517), and in those of *Frederic Herlen* († 1491) and *Martin Schaffner* (1508-1539); but, above all, in the paintings of the two *Holbeins*, first of Augsburg and afterwards of Basle (1450-1554).

Finally, *Music*,[3] sister to sculpture, painting, and poetry, harmonising thought, and swelling in sweet and inspiring melody through the old cathedral vaults, added her tribute to theirs, thus consummating and crowning the civilising mission of the arts. After the introduction of the *organ*, sacred compositions rapidly appeared, which the Church, far from viewing with suspicion, hailed with grateful recognition, thus giving to the art of music the ecclesiastical sanction and recognition which she had cheerfully accorded to her sister arts. The deficiency in musical signs and measure, or time, were, to a great extent, obviated by the pious monk, *Guido of Arezzo* (P. 1024), who, taking advantage of the interstices between the lines, invented the

[1] The details concerning Italian painters have been taken chiefly from the "Biographical Catalogue of the principal Italian painters," "by a Lady," ed. by *Ralph N. Wornum*, London, 1855. (Tr.)

[2] *Wagen*, Hub. and Jno. von Eyk, Bresl., 1822. *Schopenhauer*, John van Eyk and his Followers.

[3] Cf. *Raumer*, L. cit., lib. VI., p. 519-523; *Hurter*, L. c., Vol. IV., pp. 651, 652; †Card. *Wiseman*, Four Lectures on the Offices and Ceremonies of *Holy Week*, deliv. in Rome, 1837.

diatonic scale, called the gamut. This was still further perfected in the eleventh century by *Franco*, a master of Paris, who indicated the duration of notes by diversity of form.[1] The Order of Cîteaux gave special attention to the study of church-song. The Popes, fearing that the austere dignity of the plain chant might suffer by too frequent use of figured music,[2] restricted its employment to the higher festivals.

§ 295. *Penitential Discipline.* Cf. Bibliography, Vol. I., p. 424.

Bp. *Fessler*, Excommunication and its consequences, 2nd ed., Vienna, 1860.

The decay of spiritual life is inevitably followed by a relaxation of penitential discipline. The abuse consequent upon granting indulgences to crusaders, to those contributing to the *building of St. Peter's Church*, in Rome, and to others in commutation for similar works modified the rigours, and eventually wrought the complete destruction of the whole penitentiary system. To the earnest zeal of the early Christian ages succeeded an incorrigible levity. The insolent sarcasm of sectaries, which grew daily more violent and offensive, tended to cool the ardour for penitential practices; and they were largely aided in their work by the lethargy and remissness of many of the clergy, who, instead of instructing the faithful, strengthening the weak, and encouraging all in works of penance, wholly neglected their priestly duties. It would seem that the only arms available to bishops for the government of those committed to them were *excommunication and interdict*, and of these they made so frequent and inconsiderate a use that councils felt called upon to enact laws restricting the application of these canonical punishments.[3]

There exists an analogy between the spiritual and physical life of man; and, as if to prove the presence and activity of this law, those unhealthy and deadly phenomena in the religious and moral order were accompanied, at intervals, by others equally extraordinary and fatal in the physical, such as pestilences and the *Black Plague*.[4] These frightful scourges led to a revival of penitential severity, which, in some places, was carried to the extreme of self-flagellation. Large troops of *Flagellants*[5] went about scourging themselves, one of which was

[1] This Franco, according to others, hailed from Cologne, and was a contemporary of Frederic I. (the statement given above is according to *Hurter* and *Stenzel*); his *Ars cantûs mensurabilis* was published by *Gerbert*, De cantu et musica sacra, III., 1 sq.

[2] Cf. the remarkable Decretal of John XXII.: "Docta sanctorum Patrum," Extravagant. Comm., libb. III., Tit. I., cap. unic. It opens with a high commendation of music generally, after which the Pope reprobates the lascivious melodies of those singers, who offended against clerical modesty, by accompanying with bodily gestures the sense expressed by their words. Those so offending, whether exempt or not from episcopal jurisdiction, were suspended from clerical duties for eight days.

[3] See p. 571, Vol. 2.

[4] *Hecker*, The Black Plague in the fourteenth century, Berlin, 1832. *Tholuck*, Miscellanea, Vol. I., p. 91 sq.

[5] *Boileau*, Historia flagellantium seu de recto et perverso flagellorum usu apud Christianos, Paris, 1700. *Foerstemann*, Hist. of the Fraternities of Flagellants, Halle, 1828. *Moknike*, same subject, in *Illgens'* Hist. Review, 1833, Vol. III. *Schneegans*, The Flagellants, and especially the great Procession of Strasburg, in 1349, according to Francis of *Tischendorf*. Lps., 1840. This work contains new statements. Cf. p. 599, and *Schröckh*, Ch. H., Pt. XXXIII., pp. 446-457.

headed by *St. Vincent Ferrer*, and it required the powerful influence of Gerson, at the Council of Constance, to dissuade him from so unseemly an extravagance.[1] These enthusiasts, seeing in the disasters of the times evident tokens of God's anger, hoped to avert it by their macerations, thus trusting more in their own works than in the efficacy of Christ's merits and the instrumentality of his sacraments. Their self-sufficiency and presumption carried them to such a length that they finally rejected, with contemptuous disdain, whatever came from the Church,[2] and hence the University of Paris characterized a branch of them as "*secta contra Deum, contra famam et contra salutem ipsorum.*"

Gerson, notwithstanding that he combated them, because, as he said, "error, contempt of the priesthood, rejection of confession and the sacraments, extortion, robbery, and all manner of vices marked their presence," deprecated the employment of violent measures for their suppression.

Still more extraordinary was the appearance, about the same time, of a sect whose practices were as wide apart as the poles from those of the Flagellants. They were known as the *Dancers*, from a wild and violent dance (St. Guy's or St. John's Dance), which formed the main feature of their exercises.[3] Some derived its origin from King David (2 Sam. vi. 14; Coll. i., Chron. xv. 29), and others believed them possessed by the devil. The latter opinion seems to have been the more generally accepted, for the ecclesiastical forms of exorcism were employed to free them from the possession of the evil spirit. They were eventually pursued by the Inquisition as rigorously as even the Flagellants themselves.

§ 296. *Propagation of Christianity and Conversion of the Jews.*

In spite of the general decline just referred to, there were not wanting, particularly among the missions established in pagan lands, evidences of active faith and generous devotion. Thus it was not so much lack of energy and zeal on the part of the missionaries, as the stubborn resistance of those for whose weal they spent themselves, that retarded the conversion of the *Lithuanians* of *Europe*.[4] The exertions of the *Teutonic Knights* to propagate the Gospel in the countries bordering on Lithuania cost them dear. Eight of their number were seized and burned together, in 1260.

[1] *Gerson*, Epp. missa magistro Vincent., etc. (Opp. T. II., p. 658; *von der Hardt*, T. III., Pt. VII., p. 94 sq.)

[2] Cf. *Raynald.*, Ad. an. 1372, nro. 33. *Freiburg* Cyclop., Vol. IV., pp. 367-370; French transl., Vol. 8, pp. 533-536.

[3] Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclop., Vol. XII., art. "*Tänzer* = Dancers; French transl., Vol. 6, and *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects., art. "Flagellants;" also, *Hecker*, the Mania for Dancing, an epidemic disease in the M. A., Berlin, 1832.

[4] *Kojalowicz*, Hist. Lithuaniæ, Pars. I., Dantisci, 1659; Pt. II., Antv., 1663, 4to. Cf. *Narbut*, Bibliography heading, § 180, p. 235.

After a time, however, individual Lithuanians entered the *Russian* Church.

A still more important step towards their conversion was taken by the Grand Duke *Jagello*, who, desirous to receive the hand of the princess *Hedwig*, and with it the crown of Poland, embraced Christianity himself, and obliged his subjects to follow his example (1386).[1] After receiving baptism at Cracow, and being proclaimed King of Poland under the name of *Wladislaus III.*, he entered Lithuania, attended by a splendid retinue, caused the national pagan sanctuaries to be demolished, thus proving, to the satisfaction of his subjects, the impotency of the presiding deities; after which, assuming the office of catechist, he instructed his own vassals in the Christian religion, stood godfather for them at their baptism, and, as such, presented each with a new suit of clothes. Others, attracted by his generosity, came in troops, and so great was their number, that, it being no longer possible to baptize them individually, they were divided into groups, each of which was sprinkled with holy water, and received some common name—as Peter, Paul, and the like. Nobles and military chiefs alone were baptized singly.

Andrew Vasillo, a Polish Franciscan, and confessor to the queen, was appointed Bishop of *Wilna*. The appointment was confirmed by Pope *Urban VI.*, who placed the new bishop under his own immediate jurisdiction, and forbade the intermarriage of Greek and Roman Christians.

It is evident from the manner in which these people received baptism, that, in their case, the sacrament was no more than an outward ceremony, conveying to their minds no definite meaning or impression, and unaccompanied by any real sentiment of interior conversion; and hence, we are not surprised to learn that paganism long retained its hold on their minds.

Æneas Sylvius relates, on the testimony of the monk Jerome of Prague, that shortly before the Council of Basle, the Lithuanians were so attached to their idols that they resisted, even to the point of rebellion, the efforts of Jerome to overturn their pagan altars, notwithstanding that he acted on the combined authority of King Wladislaus and Duke Witoudt.[2]

The history of the conversion of the *Laplanders* is very similar to that of the Lithuanians,[3] they being, since 1279, subject to Sweden, and was mainly accomplished by *Hemming*, Archbishop *of Upsala*, who consecrated a church for them at Tornea in 1335.

The Jews gave small comfort to the Church during this epoch. In the Middle Ages, the legend of the *Wandering Jew* tended to

[1] *Dlugossi*, Hist. Polon. ed. Francof. 1711 f., lib. X., p. 96 sq. According to this author, Jagello was baptized with his brother, Swirigal, and his cousin, Witoudt. On this event, cf. *Dlugoss.* L. c., p. 109, and the annals of *Jno. Lindenblatt*, a contemporary author, published by *Voigt*, Kœnigsberg, 1823, p. 60 sq., 334 sq.

[2] *Æneas Sylvius*, De statu Europ. sub Frider. III., c. 20. (*Freheri*, Rerum Germ. scriptor., ed. *Struve*, T. II., p. 114.)

[3] *J. Scheffsri*, Lapponia, Frcf., 1673. 4to.

strengthen the conviction that they were a deicidal race and accursed of God. Now, as during the migration of nations, always clever speculators, they gradually accumulated, partly by commercial enterprise and partly by usurious exactions, colossal fortunes in Italy, France, and Germany. It being the generally received opinion among Christians that to loan money on interest was usury, and, as such, unlawful, all financial transactions of this character passed into the hands of the Jews, who, though "*forbidden to take interest from their co-religionists, were permitted to exact it from others*,"[1] and in this way amassed extraordinary sums. Some idea may be had of their opportunities when it is stated that the Emperor Louis of Bavaria forbade them to take a higher rate of interest than *forty* per cent. This immense wealth was frequently the cause of ferocious persecutions against them, and to account to the public, in some way, for so infamous a proceeding, they were accused of being at the bottom of all public calamities, of causing pestilence and earthquakes, and were charged with being guilty of vices the most infamous and of committing crimes the most horrid, among which were poisoning wells, murdering Christian children and drinking the blood at their paschal feasts, bewitching the atmosphere, and others equally absurd, if less atrocious. In this way was popular fury roused against them. Their condition in Germany was, at best, precarious, but it was incomparably worse in France and England.

The Popes, who are at all times and everywhere the protectors of the weak and the advocates of the oppressed, lifted up their voice in favour of the unfortunate Jews, exhorting Christians to justice and mercy, holding menaces over the refractory, and severely reproving such as wished to forcibly compel them to receive baptism. "Let no Jew," said *Innocent III.*, "be constrained to receive baptism, and he that will not consent to be baptized, let him not be molested. Let no one unjustly seize their property, disturb their feasts, or lay waste their cemeteries."

These instructions were repeated by many other Popes, and among them Gregory IX. and Innocent IV.[2]

On the other hand, attempts of a different character, and more direct, were made to reclaim the Jews from error, and lead them back to truth by enlightening their minds. Works were written with the special aim of refuting their objections against Christianity, by learned and pious schoolmen, among whom were Alanus of Ryssel, St. Thomas Aquinas, and *Raymond Martini* of Barcelona († P. A. D. 1286), whose polemico-apologetical work, entitled "*Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et*

[1] Deut. xxv.: "Non fœneraberis fratri tuo ad usuram, pecuniam, fruges, nec quamlibet aliam rem, sed alieno." Deut. xxviii.: "Fœneraberis gentibus multis, et ipse a nullo fœnus accipies." (Tr.)

[2] In *Raynaldus*, ad an. 1235, nro. 20. *Graesse*, The Tannhæuser and the Wandering Jew, Dresden, 1844, 2nd ed., 1861; *Depping*, The Jews of the Middle Ages, Stuttg., 1834, and especially, *Jost*, Hist. of the Israelites down to our own days, Berlin, 1825, sq., Pt. IV. sq. *Wiener*., Regesta of the Hist. of the Jews during the M. A., Hanov., 1862, 2 vols.

Judæos,"[1] is the most remarkable treatise of the kind written during the Middle Ages. The conversion, in the twelfth century, of the celebrated Jew *Hermann*, who became a Premonstratensian religious, was the result, not of clever controversy, but of Christian *zeal and charity*,[2] and was followed by happy consequences.

In Spain, unhappily, they enjoyed but scant toleration. Ferdinand and Isabella (1492) gave them their choice between baptism and exile. They had drawn upon themselves the popular indignation by their usury, and their connection with the Moors, now confined within a very limited territory, had, and not without reason, rendered them objects of suspicion to the civil authority. In 1492, one hundred and sixty thousand Jewish families quitted Spain, and found an asylum in Portugal. But here their condition was not much improved. In 1496, they were again obliged to make choice between baptism and exile, and the same alternative was offered to the Moors.

The Mussulman domination in Spain came to an end by the capture of *Granada*, their last stronghold, in 1492, after it had lasted eight hundred years. Immediately after the conquest of this city, the Moors were allowed the free exercise of their religion; but, owing to the discovery of a conspiracy in 1498, they, like the Jews, were forced either to accept baptism or go into exile, and the conditions of the alternative were executed with merciless severity in 1501.

The discovery of America, and the circumnavigation of Africa by Vasco de Gama, suggested the idea, which was ardently embraced, of proclaiming the Gospel to all nations, even to the uttermost bounds of the earth. Alexander VI. commissioned Ferdinand the Catholic to have Christianity introduced into America, and charged him to have the Pope's *suzerainty* recognized there, as that of Eugene IV. and Calixtus III. had been in the case of those countries that might be discovered in Africa.[3] Alexander VI. did not stop here; he sent the Vicar of the Franciscans, with twelve friars of the same Order, who were subsequently joined by a number of Dominicans, into Spain, whence they were to proceed to America. Their mission of *love* and peace was, in a great measure, frustrated by *the cruelty of the Spaniards*,[4] which, bad enough at best, has been shamelessly exaggerated. The

[1] Ed. *Carpzovius*, Lps., 1687, fol.

[2] *Weber*, Hermann the Premonstratensian, or the Jews in the M. A., Nördlingen, 1861 (treated as an historical novel).

[3] *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1443, nro. 10; an. 1454, nro. 8 sq.; an. 1455, nro. 7 sq.; an. 1493, nro. 18, 19, 24 sq. Cf. *Robertson*, Hist. of Amer., Lond., 1772, and oftener; transl. into Germ., by *Schiller*, Lps., 1781, Pt. I., p. 46 sq. **Junkmann*, The Discovery of America, and the Church (Cath. Magazin., Münster, 1846). **Margraf*, The Church and Slavery, since the Discovery of America, Tübg., 1865.

[4] Even the *French Encyclopædists* here defend the Spaniards. The eminent French national economist and well-informed traveller, *M. Chevalier*, says: "In Europe the view was current, that the red race had been exterminated by the cruelty of the Spanish conquerors. The philosophers of the eighteenth century, burning with hatred of Catholicity, made it their object to demean this eminently Catholic nation, and to represent the conquistadores, together with the Spanish clergy, as avaricious and blood-thirsty tigers. I, for one, am not afraid to maintain that the Spaniards were no brutal destroyers, but rather efficient instruments of civilisation among the red race; that their policy, upon the whole,

claims of the neophytes to the sacred rights of humanity had no abler advocates than the *Dominicans*, through whose labours the virtue of the Gospel bore fruit even in this unpropitious land.

Through the untiring exertions of the heroic *de las Casas*,[1] afterwards Bishop of *Chiapa*, supported by the earlier ordinances and vigorous measures of Cardinal *Ximenes*, *Charles V.* was brought to enact a law securing the natives in their personal freedom. This law subequently afforded an occasion and a pretext for carrying on an infamous *slave-traffic* on the coast of Africa; but to accuse the noble missionary, the great *Apostle of the Indians*, who, in the course of his missionary life, had been ceaseless in his exertions to ameliorate their condition, and had sixteen times braved the perils of the ocean to plead their cause, of having advised the substitution of the black for the red race in the labour of the mines and sugar-plantations, and of having been thus the author of the slave-trade, which is known to have existed long previously, is a cruel and outrageous calumny. The far-seeing *Ximenes*, whom his contemporaries honoured as a statesman, warrior, scholar, and saint, at once interdicted the importation of slaves into America.

§ 297. *Retrospect of the Influence exercised by the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages.*

To understand precisely the character of this influence, it will be only necessary to compare the intellectual and moral condition of the Middle Ages at the opening and close of the present period. From this comparison, it will be clear that in the interval everything had undergone a change. Instead of savage hordes, ceaselessly at war with each other; instead of deserts, morasses, and forests; instead of the darkness that was upon the whole north of Europe at the beginning of this era, we shall find, at the end of the Middle Ages, all the northern nations yielding a joyful obedience to the Gospel of Christ, lands everywhere reclaimed and in a high state of cultivation, governments well organized, social order solidly established, and an active intercourse existing among all peoples.[2] The daring spirit of European enterprise discovered the other half of the habitable globe, which opened up new and abundant sources of material prosperity and intellectual enjoyment. The humble, obscure, and neglected schools existing at the opening of the twelfth century were converted, by the pious zeal of their founders and their successors, into great and populous seats of learning, whence issued refined scholars, erudite savans,

had a *democratic*, a popular tendency." (Letters from North America, 1836, 2 vols.; Germ. transl., Lps., 1837, 4 vols.) As to the influence of Ximenes, see his biography, by *Hefele*, p. 504 sq.

[1] *Bartholomé de las Casas*, Brevissima Relacion de la Destruicion de las Indias, 1552, 4to (Lat., 1614, Germ., 1665, and other Europ. lang.) *Weise*, Las Casas (*Illgen's* Journal of Hist. Theol., 1834, Vol. IV., nro. 1). *Freiburg* Cyclop., art. *Casas*.

[2] † *Mœhler*, Miscellanea, Vol. II., p. 5 sq.; Theol. *Review* of *Freiburg*, Vol. I., p. 114 sq.

and accomplished literary men, to carry into every corner of Europe and to diffuse, with unwearied activity the wealth of their knowledge and the light of their wisdom. Sixty-six universities, of which sixteen belonged to Germany, existed in Europe before the year 1517. These universities, all the legitimate outgrowth of the genius of Christianity, gave rise to Scholasticism, a science at once subtle and profound, which compels admiration equally for loftiness of conception and refinement of speculation, resembling, in this respect, those grand old Gothic cathedrals, the products of the same genius, in which one knows not which to admire more, boldness of design or delicacy of execution. *The art of writing history* was cultivated side by side with scholastic speculation.

In every European country there flourished, at an early day, one or more distinguished *historians*. Even Iceland had her spirited *Snorro Sturleson*. Poetry kept pace with history. The voice of the bard, the trouvere, and the troubadour might be heard in cabin and castle and palace. Religious hymns and songs, inspired by faith, which, for vigour of thought, terseness of expression, and musical rhythm, will compare favourably with any similar productions of modern times, resounded through the aisles and along the vaulted ceilings of village churches and majestic cathedrals. Closely allied to poetry are the splendid triumphs of *Christian architecture*, which we now gaze upon with amazement, whose very conceptions our minds are unable to grasp, and whose vast proportions bring home to us, in unmistakable language, the consciousness of our inferiority.

When the human mind had ceased to follow in the direction hitherto pursued by speculative theology, because this was no longer adequate to the wants of the age, *the love of classic literature* revived, *the study of the Greek and Roman authors* opened out new avenues of thought, furnished fresh material to the intellect, *now prepared by long years of preceding labour* to enter upon its new sphere, and the whole world set enthusiastically about acquiring a knowledge of those ancient works which the enlightened zeal of the monks had preserved. Nay, more, from whatever side the Middle Ages are viewed, they present an aspect of unapproachable grandeur.

Animated and pervaded by a spirit unmistakably Christian, which led to an alliance between the *priesthood* and the *empire*, they hastened the march of civilisation; called into existence, or rather transformed the institution of chivalry, thereby developing in man the principle of honour; created a unity of sympathy and feeling among diverse nations, and, through the *Crusades*, gave them an impulse whose influence was felt for centuries; inspired Christians with the virtues of courage and resignation, without which the *Mendicant Orders* could never have existed; ennobled the arts by dedicating them to the service of religion; softened and refined men and manners; triumphantly opposed the aggressions of brute force; abolished servitude slowly, indeed, but effectually, and everywhere produced saints, heroes, scholars, artists, and patterns for all grades of society and every walk of life.

Is it possible that a Church which accomplished triumphs so great and so numerous, in the midst of circumstances so trying and difficult, and which successfully united in *one* single family nations dissimilar and sometimes antagonistic, should not call up in us deep and sincere feelings of love, respect, gratitude, and joy? But the joy is mingled with sorrow. Evil times threaten; there are breakers ahead. Spiritual life is chilled, discipline is relaxed, voices are raised in warning, but pass unheeded, and noble but ineffectual efforts are put forth to save the Church and reform her *head and members*. The Christian historian is borne down with pain and sorrow in beholding pontiffs, by their questionable lives and abuse of their high office, bringing dishonour upon the Church, snapping the bond uniting Christian people, and turning a deaf ear to the warning voice of saintly men who have the interests and well-being of the Church at heart. Were anything wanting to heighten the intensity of his grief, it might be found in the degeneracy of the regular and secular clergy and their baneful influence upon the religious life and morals of the laity. He looks about him, and, seeing the spirit of revolt steadily gaining strength, he reads the signs of the times, and the fearful thought is borne in upon his mind that a tremendous catastrophe is at hand. Turning his view from the present to the past, as if desirous of moving the great hand of time back a few centuries, his gaze sweeps over the vast theatre where so many splendid achievements have been accomplished, and, contemplating the society of that age, when it was still *one* in spirit and form, one in faith and morals, and one in its religious and political institutions, he cries out, in the words of a contemporary writer:[1] "Beautiful and memorable epoch, when Europe was still a Christian country, all its provinces bound together by one common interest, and governed by a *single* chief, the supreme arbiter of kingdoms, yet possessing only an inconsiderable one himself. No better proof can be given or required of the beneficent influence exercised by the spiritual government, or of its adaptability to the wants of the times, than the fact that under its inspiration every human energy leaped into life, every enterprise was successful, individuals achieved splendid triumphs in science, art, and politics, and an active intercourse, spiritual and commercial, was maintained among nations, from one end of the earth to the other, thus constituting them all members of the great Christian family. That Germany was great and powerful during the Middle Ages, as long as the Church and the Empire were in alliance, is a fact as significant as it is undeniable.

[1] *Novalis* (Prince Hardenberg), Christendom or Europe, fragment written in 1799. Cf. also the beautiful poem of *Luitpolt of Bebenburg*, in *Böhmer*, Fontes rer. Germ., T. I., vers. fin.

THIRD PERIOD.

FROM THE WESTERN SCHISM BY LUTHER DOWN TO OUR OWN TIMES (1517-1878).

FIRST EPOCH.

FROM THE RISE OF PROTESTANTISM TO ITS POLITICAL RECOGNITION BY THE TREATY OF WESTPHALIA (1517-1648).

§ 298. *Sources. Works. General Character of this Period.*

A. Political Sources and Works.—I. *Guicciardini*, see Bibliography heading § 265.—*P. Jovio*, Hist. sui temp. (1498-1513; 1521-27). Flor., 1550 sq., 2 T. f. *Adriani*, 1st. de suoi tempi (1536-74). Flor., 1583 f.; *De Thou*, Hist. sui temp. (1543-1607). Frcf. 1625, 4 T. f., and oftener. Notationes in Thuani historiarum libros, auctore Joh. Gallo J. C. (Jean Machault, S. J.), Ingolstad., 1624, 4to. *Goldast.*, Impp. Rom., Francof, 1607, fol., and Const. impp. Rom. Frcf., 1615, 3 T. f. *Koch*, Collection of the Recesses of the Empire, Frkft., 1747, 4 v. f.

II. *Robertson*, Hist. of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V., London, 1769, 3 T. 4to. This is the most valuable of his works. †*Ign. Schmidt*, Hist of the Germans, Ulm and Vienna, 1775 sq., Pts. V.-XI. †*Frederic von Buchholz*, Ferdinand I., Vienna, 1832-8, 9 vols. †*Hurter*, Ferdinand II., Schaffh., 1850 sq. *Raumer*, Hist. of Europe from the End of the Fifteenth Century. Lps., 1832 sq. 7 vols. †*Cesare Cantù*, Vols. IX. and X. †*Jörg*, Germany during the Period of Revolutions, 1522-26, from diplomatic correspondence, Freiburg, 1851. The special histories of the several countries in the collections of *Heeren* and *Ukert* are to be quoted in the proper places.

B. Religious Sources and Works.—*a. Protestant:* The biographies and works of *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, and of *Zwinglius* and *Calvin*, together with those of their most important partizans in Germany and Switzerland. (The Lives and select writings of the Founders of the *Reformed* Church, Elberfeld, 1857-63, in 10 vols.; of the *Lutheran* Church, *ibid.*, 1861 sq., 8 vols.) Add to these the following collections: *Löscher*, Complete Acts of the Reformation (1517-19), Lps., 1720 sq., 3 vols. 4to. *Kapp*, Supplements to the important Documents of the Hist. of the Reformation, Lps., 1727 sq., 4 vols. *Strobel*, Miscellanea, Nürnberg, 1778, sq., six numbers, and Literary Essays, 1784 sq., 2 and 5 vols. *Wagenseil*, Essays on the History of the Reformation, Lps., 1829. *Seidemann*, The Times of the Reformation in Saxony, Dresden, 1846 sq., 2 small vols. *Johannsen*, Development of the Spirit of Protestantism, or Collection of Important Documents on the Edict of Worms and the Protestation of Spire, Copenhagen, 1830. *Neudecker*, Documents on the Times of the Reformation, Cassel, 1836, and Authentic Acts, Nürnberg, 1838. †Dr. *Laemmer*, Analecta Romana, or Researches on Ecclesiastical History in Roman Libraries and Archives, Schaffhausen, 1861. The *same*, Monumenta Vaticana hist. eccles. sæc. XVI., Friburg., 1861; the *same*, Supplements to the Ch. H. of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Frbg., 1863; the *same*,

Meletematum Romanor. Mantissa, Ratisb., 1875. *Döllinger*, Supplements to the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Educational History of the Sixteenth Century, Munich, 1865, 2 vols. *Christian Scheuels's* Letter-book, or Supplements to the Hist. of the Reformation, published by Baron von *Roden* and *Knaacke*, Potsdam, 1867-72, 2 vols. *Spalatini*, Annales Reformationis (to 1543), ed. by Cyprian, Lps., 1768. A new ed. of all his works by *Chr. G. Neudecker* and *L. Preller*, Jena, 1851 sq. *Sleidanus* (Professor of Jurisprudence at Strasburg, †1556), Comment. de statu relig. et reip. Carol. V. Cæs. Argentorati, 1555, completed in 1556, and continued down to the year 1564. *Londorpius*, Francof., 1619, III. T. 4to, multis annotationibus illustrata a Chr. Car. (*towards the end*), Frcf., 1785, III. T. 8vo. *Hortleder*, Reflections on the Causes of the war waged in Germany against the League of Schmalkald (to 1555), Frankft., 1617 sq., 2 vols. f. *Von der Hardt*, Hist. litt. reform., Frcf. et Lps., 1717 fol. *Frid. Myconii* (Superintendent of Gotha, †1546) Hist. reformationis (1518-42), published from the manuscript of the author and illustrated in a preface by *E. S. Cyprian*. Another edition appeared at Lps. in 1718. *Seckendorf* (†1692), Comment. hist. et apol. de Lutheranismo, Frcf. et Lps. (1688) 1692, fol. (against the Jesuit, *Maimbourg*). *J. Basnage*, Hist. de la rel. des églises réformées (Rotterd., 1690, 2 vols. 12mo), La Haye, 1725, 2 vols. 4to. (against *Bossuet*). *Hottinger*, Hist. of the Helvetic Church, Zurich, 1708 sq., 4 vols. 4to. *Ruchat*, Hist. de la réforme de la Suisse, Genève, 1727 sq., 6 vols. 12mo. *Beausobre*, Hist. de la réforme (to 1530), Berlin, 1785, 3 vols. **Planck*, Hist. of the Rise, the Variations, and the Formation of Protestant Dogmatics until the Formula of Concord, Lps., 1791-1800, 6 vols. *Dr. *Lämmer*, Pre-Tridentine Catholic Theology in the Age of the Reformation, Berlin, 1858. *Marheinecke*, Hist. of the Reformation in Germany down to 1535 (1817, 2 vols.), 1831, sq. 4 vols. (Epitome of Seckendorff). **C. A. Menzel* (†1855), Modern Hist. of the Germans, from the Reformation to the Act of the German Confederacy, Breslau, 1826-48, 12 vols. (In the preface to the second, third, and fourth volumes, the author complains of the wild passion of Marheinecke), 2nd ed., Breslau, 1854-55, in 6 vols. *Ranke*, Hist. of Germany during the Age of the Reformation, Berlin, 1839, 5 vols., four editions; the last in "Complete Works," Lps., 1867 sq., Vol. I.-VI. (Cf. Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. IV., pp. 540-557; pp. 654-668), and Vienna Annuary, 1841, Vols. 93-96. *Villiers*, Essai sur l'esprit et l'influence de la réforme de Luther, Paris, 1802. *Schröckh*, Ch. H. since the Reformation, Lps., 1804-12, 10 parts (parts 9 and 10 by Tzschirner). (Tr.) *Häuser*, Hist. of the Age of the Reformation, ed. by *Oncken*, Berlin, 1868. *Hagenbach*, Lectures on the Nature and History of the Reformation, Lps., 1834-43, 6 vols. (down to most recent times); fourth revised edition, Lps., 1870-72, of his Hist. of the Church, Vols. III.-VII. The Hist. of the Church in the Eighteenth and Ninteenth Centuries, in vols. VI. and VII., is an English transl. by *J. F. Hurst*, D.D., New York, 1869. (Tr.) *Hagen*, The Literary and Religious Situation of Germany during the Age of the Reformation, Erlangen, 1841 sq., 3 vols. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, principally in Germany, Munich, 1867. *Schenkel*, The Essence of Protestantism, Schaffhausen, 1844-51, 3 vols. *Merle d'Aubigné*, Histoire de la Réformation au seizième siècle (1835-1869), or Hist. of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. More than 300,000 copies of the English translation have been sold in Great Britain and America. It is written with the utmost vivacity, is undoubtedly picturesque, and sometimes even eloquent; but the work has been censured by adverse critics as one-sided, pretentious, and bigoted. Archbishop Spalding called him an arch-perverter of history. Among *M. D's* other historical productions are—Le Luthéranisme et la Réforme, Paris, 1844; Le Protecteur, ou la République d'Angleterre aux Jours de Cromwell (1848). (Tr.) *Chas. P. Krauth* (D.D., Prof. in the Evang. Lutheran Theological Seminary, etc., in the University of Pennsylvania). The Conservative Reformation and its Theology, Philadelphia, 1871. (Tr.)

β. Works by Catholics.—*Surius* (Carthusian of Cologne, †1578), Chronicon ab a. 1500 usque 1566, Colon., 1567, continued to 1573 and often published (against Sleidanus). *Siméon Fontaine*, Histoire catholique de nostre tems touchant l'estat de la religion chrétienne, contre l'histoire de J. Sleidan, Anvers, 1558. *Roveri Pontani* (Carmelite of Brussels) Vera narratio rerum ab a. 1500 usque ad a. 1559, in republica christiana memorabilium, Colon., 1559 f. *Cochlæus* (Canon of Frankfurt on the Main, Mentz, Vienna, and Breslau, †1552), Comment. de actis et scriptis Lutheri, Mogunt, 1549. Cf. *M. de Weidige-Cremer*, De Joan. Cochlæi vita et scriptis, Monast., 1865. *Otto* (of Breslau), Cochlæus as a Humanist and His Colloquy with Luther (Austrian Quarterly of Cath. Theol., year 1866, nro. 1.) *Ulenberg* (at first Protestant and student at Wittenberg, then Catholic, †as parish priest at Cologne, 1597), Vitæ hæresiarcharum Luth., Melanchth., Majoris, Illyrici, Osiandri. *Ejusdem*, Causæ graves et justæ, cur Catholicis in communione veteris ejusque veri Christianismi constanter usque ad vitæ finem permanendum sit, etc., Colon., 1589. Cf. the article, "Anti-Reformers of the Sixteenth Century," in *Aschbach's*

Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I.; *Raynaldi*, Continuatio annal. Baronii, and the historians of the Council of Trent, *Paolo Sarpi* and *Pallavicini*. **Bossuet*, Hist. des variations des églises protestantes, Paris, 1688, 2 vols. 4to; 1734, 4 vols. (in the new edit. of Bossuet's works, Paris, 1836, Vols. V. and VI., with the defence against Jurieu and Basnage). Eng. transl., Antwerp, 1742, 2 vols.; New York, 1850, 2 vols. (Tr.) *Maimbourg*, S. J., Hist. du Luthéranisme, Paris, 1680, 4 vols. The *same*, Hist. du Calvinisme, Paris, 1682. *Varillas*, Hist des Révolutions arrivées dans l'Europe en matière de Religion; 2nd edit., Amst., 1689-90, 6 vols. **Riffel*, Christian Ch. H. from the great Schism to our own Days, Vol. I., Mentz (1841) 1844 (to the end of the War of the Peasants); Vol. II., 1842 (to the Peace of Religion, 1555); Vol. III. (Zwinglius in Switzerland). †*Boost*, the Reformation of Germany, Ratisbon, 1845. **Döllinger*, The Reformation, its internal Developments and Effects (according to the testimony of Protestants), Ratisbon, 1846 sq., 3 vols.; 2nd revised and augm. edit., Ratisbon, 1848. (Tr.) (**E. von Jarcke*), Studies and Sketches of the Hist. of the Reformation, Schaffhausen, 1846. †*Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theol. in Germany, Munich, 1866. Among the Manuals of Ch. H., we mention, especially, **Döllinger*, Vol. II., Pt. II., being a continuation of Hortig, Landshut, 1828, and *Ritter*, 6th ed., Vol. II., down to recent times. †*Palma*, H. e., T. IV., Rom., 1846. Dr. *F. X. Kraus*, Text-Book of Modern Ch. H. (being Vol. III. of his entire work), Treves, 1875.

GENERAL CHARACTER OF THIS PERIOD.

This period has its own peculiar characteristics, which impress upon it features essentially different from those of the preceding one. These are:

1. In general, a complete severance of the close alliance formerly existing between Church and State; and, in particular, an irreparable rupture between the Papacy and the Empire, of which there were many and unmistakable indications as early as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

2. A sundering of the bond of unity by faith, giving rise in the countries of Christian Europe, heretofore *united* and professing but *one* religion, to three distinct religious bodies, viz., Lutheran, Reformed or Calvinistic, and Anglican, not to speak of countless minor sects, all wholly external to and in revolt against the Catholic Church, whose numbers were greatly diminished by their apostasy.

3. Hence, once the exclusive importance attached to faith by the early reformers had been rejected, the steady hold which religious truths had on men's minds was shaken, and the religious view of life and tone of science, so characteristic of the preceding period, were superseded among Protestants by a so-called *Humanism*, and, through the consistent development of the latter, by an infidel, worldly, and anti-Christian spirit.

4. Again, this religious schism alienated *science* from religion; profaned the sanctity of domestic life; inaugurated a spirit of controversy which not unfrequently carried disputants to unseemly excesses; engendered ceaseless strifes; and called forth feelings of mutual distrust and estrangement.[1]

5. Finally, the schism was the cause and occasion of *political revolutions* so violent and far-reaching, that, in many countries, the introduction of Protestantism was accompanied by a change of dynasty, and in Poland and Ireland by a loss of national independence.

[1] On the influence of the schism on literature, see * Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. XIX. year 1847, in three articles.

Modern, like ancient and mediæval Church History, is divided into two epochs—the first embracing the interval between 1517 and 1648, and the second that between the Treaty of Westphalia and our own day. To give a full and spirited exposition of the events of the first epoch, it will be convenient to make the pseudo-ecclesiastical reform of Luther, which was in fact the mainspring of the religious and political commotions that took place in the interval, the *cardinal fact*, to which all others are to be more or less directly referred. Hence, it will be necessary to trace the history of this pseudo-reform in its origin, progress, and development; to watch the course of the hitherto dominant Catholic Church; to observe her policy, movements, counter-movements, and the fresh display of her energies; and, finally to note the relations of the various sects to each other. The reasons for so arranging the subject-matter of the first epoch of this period that *the history of Protestantism will for the time be brought forward with greater prominence than that of the Catholic Church*, will be obvious from the above considerations. In the second epoch, an order just the reverse of this will be followed.

CHAPTER I.

RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS IN GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND.

A.—To the Formal Separation of Protestants, of which the Confession of Augsburg was the occasion (1517-1530).

§ 299. *Luther's Manifest against Indulgences.*

Luther's works, in Latin, Vit., 1545 sq., 7 vols. folio; Jena, 1556-58, 4 vols. fol.; in German, Wittenberg, 1539 sq., 12 vols. fol.; Jena, 1555 sq., 8 vols. fol. Moreover, two Supplementary vols. by *Aurifaber*, Eisleben, 1564 and '65. Exclusively German writings of Luther are found in the edition of *Sagittarius*, published at Altenburg, 1661-64, 10 vols. Supplementary volume to all former editions (by *Zeidler*), Halle, 1702; Lps. edit., 1729-40, in 22 vols. fol.; the *Halle edition*, by *J. G. Walch*, 1740-50, 24 pts. 4to. (Only the *German translation* of the Latin works is given in the last two editions). Edition in both original languages by *Plochmann* and *Irmischer*, Erlangen, 1826-56, 67 vols. Conf. *Irmischer*, A brief History of the complete edition of Luther's works (Periodical for Protestantism and Church, 1850, nro. 1). *Luther's* letters, circulars, and memoirs, edited by *De Wette*, Berlin, 1825-28, 5 pts. Supplement thereto, by *Dr. Burkhardt*, Lps., 1866. *Melanchthon*, Hist. de vita et actis Lutheri, Vit. 1546; ed. Augusti, Vratisl., 1817. In addition to these works, one may also consult the biographies of Luther, by *Cochlæus*, *Ulenberg*, and in modern times, *Uckert*, Gotha, 1817, 2 vols.: *Pfizer* (who idolizes his hero), Stuttg., 1836; *Schenkel*, The Reformers (Luther, Zwinglius, Calvin, and Melanchthon), Wiesbaden, 1856. *Jürgens*, Luther from his birth until the controversy on Indulgences, Lps., 1846, 4 vols., to be compared with *Audin*, Hist. de la vie, des écrits et des doctrines de Martin Luther, Paris, 1839, 2 vols. ed. IIème., Paris, 1841; Engl. ed., Life of Luther, transl. by Bp. J. M. McGill, Philadelphia, 1841, 2 vols; also by W. B. *Turnbull*, Germ. ed., Augsb., 1843. (It contains many

things incorrect and inexact.) "Luther's work and Luther's works," in the *Catholic* of A. D. 1827, by *J. von Görres*. Cf. von *Sybel*, Journal of History, New Phenomena of Lutheran Literature, Vol. 27, year, 1872.—TR. adds: The Reformatory Writings of *Dr. Martin Luther*, by Zimmermann; the *Life of Martin Luther*, Related from Original Authorities, with sixteen engravings, by *Moritz Meurer*. Engl. transl. by a Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 8vo, New York, Ludwig & Co. The *Life of Martin Luther*, Gathered from his own Writings, by *M. Michelet;* transl. by *G. H. Smith*, F. G. S., New York. The Table Talk (Tischreden), or *Familiar Discourse* of *Martin Luther;* transl. by *Wm. Hazlitt*, Esq., London. **Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclopæd., art. "*Luther*," by *Döllinger*.

To the elements of political strife, which seriously threatened the peace of Europe at the close of the last period, religious difficulties at once grave and numerous, and containing the germs of incalculable mischief[1] in the near future, were now added. Everything combined to weaken the great influence formerly exercised by the *Popes* in European affairs, of which it will be sufficient to instance the papal schism, the unhappy events that took place at the Councils of Constance and Basle, or were occasioned by their action, and, finally, the worldly lives and taste for war which characterized some of the chief pastors of the Church. Although the warlike and chivalrous *Emperor Maximilian* had succeeded in establishing (1495) public peace in many of the German states, and had secured its maintenance by the institution of the Imperial Chamber (the supreme court of the German Empire), his authority was nevertheless too much enfeebled to enable him to act energetically and decisively in critical emergencies occurring either within or without his empire. Cities asserted their freedom and grew in wealth and prosperity; the nobility drew out a painful existence in ignorance and poverty; and the bulk of the people, constantly oppressed, were ready at any moment to rise in open rebellion. The cavaliers, warriors by profession and never content but when in the midst of its excitements, felt the restraints of law and order, longed for the return of the days when might was right, and impatiently awaited a favourable opportunity to draw their swords, and deal a decisive and fatal blow against the dominations of princes and the authority of priests. War came at last. On the one hand, the call of Charles, grandson of Maximilian (by Philip the Fair) to the throne of Spain (1516), and shortly after (1519) to the imperial crown and succession in Austria, had excited *the jealousy of France* and her young and ambitious king, *Francis I.* (1515), *against the House of Hapsburg;* and on the other, Austria, Germany, and Hungary in the East were seriously threatened by *the alarming advance of Turkish domination.* In the midst of these grave religious and political complications, accompanied in France, Spain, and England by the triumph of royalty and the decline of the nobility, and in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, where the aristocracy of the clergy and the nobles was particularly powerful, by important limitations of the royal power and prerogative,

[1] Cf. *Mœhler's* Essay on the Situation of the Church in the fifteenth century and at the beginning of the sixteenth (Complete Works, Vol. II.); and *Græne*, Situation of the German Church before the Reformation, in the Tuebing. Quart., year 1862, nro. 1, pp. 84-138, who, however, arrives at a somewhat different conclusion.

it was plain that one of two things would inevitably come about. Either some great man gifted with strength of character and a talent for organisation and government, and having the interest of Church and State sincerely at heart, would arise to avert the impending danger, by allaying conflicting passions through the operation of existing authority and the agency of institutions called into being with the special view of meeting the exigencies of the moment; or, in the absence of one possessing these qualifications, the world should be prepared to behold a rash and daring man inconsiderately flinging from him the brand that would surely kindle the long-threatened conflagration, evoke ferocious passions, and lead to bloody conflicts and political revolutions.

The first to come forward to raise his hand against the religious and social fabric, and deal it a blow under which it reeled, was *Martin Luther*.

Martin Luther was born at Eisleben, in Saxony, November 10, 1483, of poor but respectable parents. Shortly after Martin's birth, his father quitted Eisleben, and moved to Mansfeld, whose citizens rewarded his many virtues by conferring upon him an office of public trust.

Martin was early taught to read and write, and formed to the practices of Christian virtue. Possessing a fine voice and correct ear, he was received among the choir boys of the school, and, his parents being too poor to defray the expenses of a liberal education, he, as was the custom in Germany, went about singing at the windows of the wealthy to procure a pittance to enable him to prosecute his studies. He was sent at the age of fourteen, to the Franciscan School at Magdeburg, where he received his tuition free, and was barely able to pay his board with the paltry sums flung to him from the windows under which he sang. After passing a year of this precarious existence, he went to Eisenach, where he was more fortunate. Passing down one of the principal streets of the city, he stopped before a house whose size and elegance bespoke the wealth of the inmates, and began to sing. A lady appeared at the window, and, charmed by the quality of the young scholar's voice and the expression of his singing, threw him some coins, and invited him in. Ascending the stairs, Martin was affectionately received by the lady, and invited to partake of her hospitality. This was Ursula Cotta, who continued a second mother to the young wanderer while he remained in her house. Martin now pursued his studies vigorously under the monks, and had as his professor of grammar, rhetoric, and poetry, the celebrated J. Trebonius, rector of the monastery of Discalced Carmelites. At the age of sixteen he had mastered the Latin tongue. In 1501, his father, who had become a master miner, and whose circumstances were consequently materially improved, sent him to the University of Erfurt, with a view to have him study law. The legal profession, however, does not seem to have been much to Martin's taste; for, instead of law, he ardently applied himself to the study of the dialectics of the Nominalists and to the Latin classics.

In 1505, he took his degree of master of arts and opened a course of lectures on the Physics and Ethics of Aristotle.[1] These studies, however, were wholly inadequate to give peace and quiet to Luther's *restless and religious* mind. Naturally disposed to take an extreme view of everything, and horrified by the sudden death of his young friend Alexis, who was struck dead at his side by lightning, he at once closed the writings of Aristotle, and, without even taking leave of his fellow-students, quitted the university on the night of July 17, and going directly to the Augustinian Convent of Erfurt, "to dedicate himself to God," was kindly received by the monks. His father, ambitious to see his son a learned professor of law and to cut a figure in the world, wrote him an angry letter deprecating his course. During the early part of his novitiate, he was made to perform the menial offices of the monastery; but from these he was, after a time, relieved, through the intercession of friends; and, in 1507, despite the remonstrances of his father and others, made his profession, and took priest's orders. He was so greatly agitated while saying his first Mass, that he would have left off at the Canon and come down from the Altar, had not the prior prevented him. Yet he tells us himself that there was no more pious and faithful priest than he, and, though subject to fits of melancholy, he roused and comforted his troubled spirit by reading passages of Holy Writ pointed out to him by his brethren and superiors. Luther learned that the monks, far from being unfamiliar with the Scriptures, possessed many copies of them in their library, and, instead of preventing him from reading them, encouraged him to make them his chief study.[2] He followed their advice, applying himself specially to the study of the commentaries of *Nicholas de Lyra*. *Dr. John Staupitz*,[3] Provincial of the Augustinians of Meissen and Thuringia, who had directed Luther's attention to the works of *St. Augustine*, was so pleased with his aptitude and proficiency, that he recommended him to Frederic the Wise, Prince-elector of Saxony, who was then casting about for professors for his new University of *Wittenberg*. Here he first (1508) taught dialectics, and having taken his first degree, or baccalaureate, in theology, gave lectures in this branch also. At the earnest request of Dr. Staupitz, but much against his own will, he consented to take upon him the formidable office of preaching the Gospel.

The learning, quick intelligence, and piety of Luther specially commended him to his superiors, and pointed him out as one well fitted to undertake important offices of trust. Hence he, with another brother, was selected to visit Rome in 1510, for the purpose of transacting some business relating to his Order. Coming in view of Rome, he fell on his knees and cried out, "*Hail, Rome, Holy City, thrice*

[1] †*Kampschulte*, The University of Erfurt and its Relation to Humanism and the Reformation, Treves, 1858-62, two pts.; *idem*, De Georgio Wicelio, Bonnæ, 1856; De Joanne Croto Robiano, Bonnæ, 1862.

[2] *Luther's* Works, Vol. XXI., p. 21; Meurer, p. 25. (Tr.)

[3] *Joannis Staupitii*, Opera, quæ reperiri potuerunt omnia, ed. *Knaake*, Potisdam., 1867. Cf. also **Pasig* (Superintendent of Schneeberg), John VI., Bp. of Meissen, Lps., 1867.

sanctified by the blood of martyrs." His heart glowed with holy fervour as he visited the shrines and sanctuaries of the Eternal City, and "he almost regretted that his parents were not already dead, that he might, by saying Masses, reciting prayers, and doing good works, deliver their souls from purgatory." He was, however, particularly scandalized *on hearing* that many of the Roman ecclesiastics were infected with a spirit of unbelief.

On his return to Germany, he was declared licentiate of Sacred Theology on the feast of St. Luke, October 18, 1512, and the day following, during the ringing of the great bell of All Saints' Church, which was prescribed by the statutes of the university, invested with the insignia of the doctorate. Speaking of this event, Luther himself says: "I was obliged to take the degree of doctor, and *to promise under oath* that I would preach the Holy Scriptures, which are very dear to me, *faithfully and without adulteration.*"[1] The better to fit himself to become an efficient professor of Holy Scripture, or, as some say, from motives of vanity, he was at special pains to acquire a thorough knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, so necessary as aids to gain the true sense of the *Psalter* and Epistles of St. Paul to the *Romans* and the *Galatians*. Even at this early age he had already embraced, in a confused way, the doctrine that good works are wholly worthless, and that *faith alone* is all-sufficient for salvation.

It was at this time that indulgences were published in Germany by the authority of the munificent and splendid *Leo X.*, the proceeds of which were to be applied to the building of *St. Peter's Basilica* in Rome, commenced by Julius II.[2] The office of publishing[3] the indulgences was given to the Elector *Albert*, a prince of the House of Brandenburg, Archbishop of *Mentz* and Magdeburg, and administrator of the diocese of Halberstadt, who was as extravagant and as fond of magnificent displays as Leo himself.

Albert selected the Dominican *Tetzel of Leipsic* to preach the indulgences to the people of his dioceses. A ripe scholar and a fine popular speaker, Tetzel proclaimed the efficacy of indulgences in language at once ardent and energetic,[4] which, while at times sufficiently offensive to call forth expressions of hostility against both the

[1] *Luther's* Works, XX., p. 336; *Melanch.*, in vita, p. 13; *Meurer*, p. 33.

[2] The bull in *von der Hardt*, L. c., T. IV., p. 4.

[3] †*Hennes*, Albert of Brandenburg, Archbp. of Mentz and Magdeburg, Mentz, 1858. *Jac. May*, Albert II., Elector, Cardinal, and Archbishop, together with eighty-two documents and appendices, Munich, 1866.

[4] Against the boundless misrepresentations and unscrupulous fabrications in the early biographies of Tetzel, put into circulation by such men as *Hecht*, Vitemb., 1717; *Vogel*, Lps., 1717 and 1727, and *Hoffmann*, 1844, cf. *Correspondence of two Catholics on the Controversy between Tetzel and Luther on Indulgences, Frankfort on the Main, 1817; †**Grœne*, Tetzel and Luther, or a Biography and Vindication of Dr. Tetzel, Preacher of Indulgences, 2nd ed., Sœst., 1860 Moreover, Tetzel in his Instruction to Parish Priests (Oct. 31, 1517) expressly prescribed that "whosoever, *having confessed* and *being penitent* (*confessus et contritus*), shall bring alms (*eleemosynam*, i. e., for this special purpose), shall obtain remission of temporal and canonical punishment." See *Læscher*, L. c., I., 414, and the ordinary formula of absolution which the Lutheran Seckendorf himself (Hist. Lutheranismi, lib. II., sect. 6, gives in the following terms: "Misereatur tui Dominus noster

man and his mission, was by no means so intemperate or extravagant as his enemies would have us believe.

As the civil and ecclesiastical authorities had but recently enacted measures restricting the sale of indulgences, the recent publication of them gave no little offence.[1] In the year 1500, the electoral princes entered a protest against their publication, and enacted in 1510 that sums of money arising from this source should not be sent out of the country. The Emperor Maximilian was at special pains to see that the latter provision was faithfully executed. *John, Bishop of Meissen*, had also issued a prohibition, cautioning anyone in his diocese against receiving the preachers of indulgences; and a similar prohibition had been published in the diocese of Constance. Luther was, therefore, not the first to protest against the flagrant abuses incident to putting indulgences on sale; but had he been, no blame could have attached to him, for he would have been only exercising a right which he had in virtue of his office of preacher, confessor, and doctor of theology. So also, when, by the advice of his friends, he affixed his famous ninety-five propositions to the doors of the church attached to the castle of Wittenberg, on the Vigil of All Saints (October 31, 1517), he did no more than what was sanctioned by the usage of that age. It would seem that he might claim the greater right to do so, inasmuch as he openly proclaimed the doctrine of indulgences, saying in his seventy-first proposition: "Whosoever speaks against the truths of papal indulgences, let him be anathema;" and protested that it was not his wish or purpose to say aught against Holy Writ, or the teachings of the Popes, and the Fathers of the Church. No fault, therefore, could be found with him for having denounced whatever was really extravagant and excessive in the preaching of indulgences, and for having called for some authoritative settlement of the question, of which, as he afterwards confessed, "he knew no more at that time than those who came to inquire of him."[2] That he was sadly in need of some elementary instruction on the nature of indulgences, their conditions and effects, is painfully evident from the grotesque character and intemperate language of many of his propositions.[3] Luther's fundamental principle, more fully and distinctly drawn out as years went

Jesus Christus, per merita suæ sanctissimæ passionis te absolvat et ego auctoritate ejusdem et beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum et sanctissimi domini nostri papæ mihi concessa et in hac parte mihi commissa te absolvo: primo ab omnibus censuris a te quomodolibet incursis, deinde ab omnibus peccatis, delictis et excessibus—etiam sedi Apostolicæ reservatis, in *quantum* claves sanctæ matris ecclesiæ se extendunt, remittendo tibi per plenariam indulgentiam omnem pœnam in *purgatorio* pro præmissis debitam, et restituo te sanctis sacramentis ecclesiæ et unitati fidelium ac innocentiæ et puritati, in qua eras, quando baptizatus fuisti, etc. In nomine P., F., et Spiritus Scti. Amen.

[1] See p. 40, note 2.

[2] In *Læscher*, Complete Acts of the Reformation, Pt. I., p. 367 sq., and in the editions of Luther's Works, e. g., that of Jena, Pt. I., Altenburg, Vol. I.; that of *Walch*, Vol. XVIII., p. 255 sq. The above passage was transcribed literally by *Ranke* from the *original* text preserved in the royal library of Berlin, and published in his complete Works, Vol. VI., pp. 80-85.

[3] In his twenty-ninth proposition, Luther asks: "Who knows if every soul would desire to be delivered from purgatory?" Again, in his eighty-second: "Why does not the

on, viz., that "*God alone, independently of human exertion, is all in all in the affair of man's salvation,*" was substantially contained, and but thinly disguised, in these propositions. Failing to detect this latent poison, many loudly applauded his course, and among them the Bishop of Würzburg,[1] who, in a letter to the Elector, *Frederic the Wise*, begged that prince to take Luther under his protection, and shield him from his enemies. Luther wrote to the Archbishop of Mentz, praying him to mark out the proper course to be followed in the affair of indulgences, that their publication might be made in a manner at once becoming and lawful; but in failing to wait an answer, he indicated a disposition to subvert established order, and set law at defiance. On the other hand, the Archbishop cannot be held entirely blameless; for, in writing to Luther, after the latter had begun to make a stir in the world, he said:[2] "As yet I have not found time to read your writings, or even to glance through them; I leave the judgment on the questions raised in them *to my superiors in rank and dignity*. I have learned, however, with sincere sorrow and no little displeasure, that grave doctors engage in heated controversy concerning such trivial questions as the *Pope's power;* whether he holds his office of Head of the Church by divine or human authority; whether or no man enjoys free will; and similar points, concerning which no earnest Christian gives himself very much concern." He had, however, submitted the affair to the arbitration of the theological faculty of Leipzig.[3]

The great applause that greeted the appearance of Luther's propositions revealed the intense indignation everywhere evoked by the abuse of indulgences. Within the short interval of two months they were known in almost every country of Europe. Many written replies to them were at once put forth, the first being the *Three Days' Labour* (*Tridui labor*) of the Roman Dominican, *Sylvester Prierias* (*Magister Sacri Palatii*), in which the claims advanced in behalf of the papal power[4] were in a measure excessive. *Tetzel* followed with a refutation of Luther, entitled "*On Indulgences and Grace,*" written in German, and published simultaneously with the theses of the Reformer. In a disputation

Pope, since he may open heaven to so many for a few wretched florins, of his sacred charity empty purgatory of the suffering souls confined there?" Moreover, while some of the propositions affirm that indulgences are useless and harmful, others affirm that they should not be made light of. Among the most objectionable propositions are the thirty-sixth, according to which whosoever is truly *sorry* for his sins receives remission of them and the punishment due to them; the fifth and twentieth, which declare that the Pope can remit only such penalties as are imposed by himself or the Church, but not those imposed by God; the eighth, tenth, and thirtieth, which restrict canonical penalties to the living, thereby exempting the dead from such hardship, and denying their need of indulgences; and the fifty-eighth, which denies that the treasures of the Church, whence indulgences are drawn, are the merits of Christ and his Saints. Cf. the scathing criticism of the propositions in *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 32 sq.; 2nd ed., p. 65 sq.

[1] *Surius*, Ad an. 1517, declares: "In ipsis hujus tragœdiæ initiis visus est Lutherus etiam plerisque viris gravibus et eruditis non pessimo zelo moveri planeque nihil spectare aliud, quam ecclesiæ reformationem." Cf. *Erasm.*, epp. lib. XVIII., p. 736.

[2] Luther's Works, apud *Walch*, Pt. XV., p. 1640.

[3] See *Wiedmann*, John Eck, p. 85.

[4] Dialogus in præsumtuosas Lutheri conclusiones de potestate Papæ (1517), apud *Læscher*, Pt. II., p. 12 sq.

undertaken by the same writer at the University of Frankfurt on the Oder,[1] on the occasion of his taking the degree of licentiate in theology, and under the presidency of the Dominican monk, *Conrad Koch*, better known as *Conrad Wimpina*, he defended one hundred and six propositions, controverting the errors of Luther with such marked ability as to demonstrate beyond all doubt that he thoroughly understood the Catholic teaching on indulgences, was an excellent theologian, and possessed a well-trained and cultivated mind. The burden of these propositions was to show that confession and *satisfaction* (*confessio et satisfactio*) are conditions absolutely necessary to the full remission of sins in the sacrament of penance. *Indulgences*, by which the *vindictive* canonical punishments due to sin are remitted, have to do with satisfaction only, and have no connection with *medicinal* penitence, or remedies for keeping the passions in check, which must be applied by the penitent himself.[2]

Finally, as early as January 20, 1518, Tetzel was again at the University of Frankfurt, on the occasion of taking his *degree of doctorate in theology*,[3] defending fifty propositions in support of *papal power*.

Among the adversaries of Luther was *Dr. John Eck*, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt. During his stay at the Universities of Heidelberg, Tübingen, Cologne, and Freiburg, he had stored away vast treasures of philosophical and theological learning, which his rugged constitution, his vigorous, acute, and versatile intellect enabled him to turn to the best practical account.[4] At the request of the Bishop of *Eichstädt*, where he held a canonry, he sent to the former a copy of Luther's theses, with the objectionable propositions marked with obelisks,[5] and refuted in marginal notes. This communication, which was supposed to be of a private character, was published in the beginning of Lent, 1518, without previous knowledge on the part of its author, and against his will. Four years later (1522), *Hochstraten*, a Dominican of Cologne, to whom a contest with *Reuchlin* had given some notoriety, also entered the lists against Luther,[6] whom he combated in several works, particularly after the

[1] *†*Mittermüller*, Conrad Wimpina, in the Periodical "*The Catholic*," year 1869, Vol. I., pp. 641-681; Vol. II., pp. 129-165. *Wimpina*, a native of Buchen, and buried in the Franconian Benedictine monastery of *Amorbach*, possessed an almost cyclopædical knowledge of the current learning of his age, and could, when occasion demanded, turn it to excellent account in debate.

[2] *Liebermann*, Institut. theolog., ed. V., T. V., p. 195: "Id etiam observandum est, quod pœnitentiæ injungantur non tantum in *vindictam peccati*, sed etiam tanquam *remedia* ad coërcendas cupiditates et curandam animi infirmitatem ex peccatis contractam. Sed *ab hac medicinali pœnitentia non eximunt indulgentiæ*."

[3] Both the theses of *Luther* and the counter-theses of *Tetzel*, apud *Læscher*, L. c., Pt. I., p. 484 sq.; 504 sq. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 36 sq.; 2nd ed., p. 71 sq.

[4] Luther had previously borne him witness, that he was an "insignis vereque ingeniosæ eruditionis et eruditi ingenii homo" (*De Wette*, Luther's Letters, Vol. I., p. 59). ‡**Wiedemann*, Dr. John Eck, Professor in the University of Ingolstadt, Vienna, 1865. Cf. also †**Meuser*, in the *Catholic* Journal of Science and Art, Year III., Cologne, 1846.

[5] Apud *Læscher*, Pt. II., p. 64 sq.

[6] Cum divo Augustino colloquia contra enormes atque perversos Martini Lutheri

year 1526. Hochstraten and his colleagues were indiscreet in their mode of attack; for, instead of confining themselves to the question at issue, they went aside from their main purpose to take a fling at the Humanists, whom they charged with being at the bottom of all the trouble, singling out *Erasmus* for special animadversion.[1] Such irrelevant advocacy of their cause roused and embittered their adversaries, and harmed only themselves and the great truths they were upholding.[2]

Luther threw himself with all his wonted energy and vehemence into the thick of the fight, and in an incredibly short time had written replies to all his assailants. His reply, entitled the *Asterisks*[3] (*Asterisci*), to the *Obelisks* (*Obelisci*)of Eck, abounds in intemperate, invective, and unseemly abuse,[4] is frequently *contradictory* in its assertions, and is singularly *subversive of the faith of the Church.* Luther had some time previously, in a discussion which took place in the Augustinian Convent of Heidelberg (April, 1518), avowed the anti-Catholic propositions which he afterwards maintained,[5] and succeeded in gaining Bucer over to his cause. Dr. Andrew Bodenstein, who took the name of *Carlstadt* from his birth-place,[6] declared in his favour at Wittenberg.

errores, Colon., 1522. On all the Catholic adversaries of Luther, cf. Dr. *Lämmer*, The Pre-Tridentine Catholic Theology of the Age of the Reformation, Berlin, 1858, pp. 1-17.

[1] "*Erasmus*," they said, "laid the egg, and Luther hatched it. The heresy is wholly the work of Greek scholars and polished rhetoricians." Erasmus at first contented himself with an apologetic defence. He wrote to *Hochstraten:* "Hæc studia non obscurant theologicam dignitatem, sed illustrant, non oppugnant, sed famulantur" (*v. d. Hardt*, Hist. lit. reformationis II., 13). But he subsequently maligned the inquisitors. He said: "Olim hæreticus habebatur, qui dissentiebat ab evangeliis, ab articulis fidei, aut his, quæ cum his parem obtinent auctoritatem;—nunc quidquid non placet, quidquid non intelligunt, hæresis est. Græce scire hæresis est expolite loqui hæresis est, quidquid ipsi non faciunt, hæresis est." Epp. lib. XII., p. 403.

[2] Erasmus, quoted by Seckendorf, says apropos of the method of Hochstraten: "Nulla res magis conciliavit omnium favorem Luthero," and of Prierias: "Scripsit Prierias . . . sed ita tamen ut causam indulgentiarum fecerit deteriorem."

[3] Both are given in *Læscher*, Vol. II., p. 62 sq., and 333 sq.; Vol. III., p. 660 sq. *Lutheri*, Opp. Latin, Jenæ, T. I.

[4] Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., 2nd ed., p. 73 sq. Speaking of *Sylvester Prierias*, ex gr., he says: "His pamphlet is the incoherent and furious raving of the very devil, whose tool Prierias is. It is replete, from beginning to end, with abominable and horrible blasphemies, and I make no doubt that its libellous utterances issued from the mouth of Satan, in the very centre of hell. . . . Should the Pope and the Cardinals refuse to impose silence on this impudent and infernal blasphemer, I shall break with the Church of Rome, and brand her, the Pope, and the Cardinals as the abomination of desolation. . . . Away with thee, thou infamous, accursed, and blasphemous Rome, the anger of God is at length come upon thee. . . . Since we hang thieves, put murderers to the sword, and consign heretics to the flames, why do we not rather pursue with every manner of weapon these pestiferous teachers of perdition, the Pope, the Cardinals, and the Bishops, and the whole horde of the Roman Sodom, . . . and wash our hands in their blood? Nor is this their adequate punishment . . . They must suffer eternally in hell?" These fragments will give an idea of Luther's method of meeting his opponents. *Ranke*, speaking of this literary tilt, says: "However contemptible and easy of refutation the pamphlet of Prierias may have seemed to Luther, *he nevertheless still kept a check upon his speech, biding his time*, not wishing to draw upon himself the enmity of the Curia." Germ. Hist. of the Age of the Reformation, Vol. I., p. 320; Complete Works, Vol. I., p. 213.

[5] Luther's Works in *Walch*, Pt. XVIII., p. 66 sq.

[6] Previously to the appearance of Luther's *Asterisci*. Carlstadt had written the *Apolo-*

The various polemical writings which the occasion called forth, fixed public attention upon the principles of *Christian anthropology*, which, as history proves, may lead to the gravest errors when approached and discussed in any other than a calm and reverential frame of mind.

§ 300. *Negotiation between Rome and Luther—Disputation at Leipsig—Eck, Emser, and Melanchthon.*

Leo X., learning the condition of affairs in Germany, appointed temporarily the learned Venetian, *Gabriel*, the then pro-magister of the Augustinian Hermits, to the vacant office of generalship of the Order (1518). The Pope, led astray by the belief that the whole trouble was no more than what *Cochlæus*[1] said it was—a rivalry between two religious Orders and a quarrel among a few monks—instructed Gabriel, acting in his official capacity of General of the Order, to remind Luther of his vow of obedience, and in virtue of it to lay upon him the obligation of keeping silence. He was further instructed to do all he could to have the Elector, Frederic the Wise, set his face against Luther, and oppose his designs. The Emperor *Maximilian*, more penetrating and far-seeing than the Pope, called attention, in words of weighty import, to the dangers and gravity of the threatening struggle. "In a little time," he foretold, "private opinion and the folly of man will be set up in place of the truths of tradition, and the principles underlying the scheme of salvation."[2]

The theses and their defence sent by Luther to Pope Leo X.,[3] accompanied with a letter humbly begging the favour of an investigation, and expressing his pacific *intentions* and his readiness to make an unconditional surrender of his own will to that of his superiors,[4] are the first act in a long drama of hypocritical professions. At the close of this letter he said: "Hence, Most Holy Father, *I cast myself at thy feet*, with all that I have and am. Give life, or take it; call, recall, approve, reprove; *your voice is that of Christ, who presides and speaks in you.*" To Staupitz, he wrote in the same tenor.[5]

Leo appointed a court to try the case, and cited (August 7, 1518) Luther to appear at Rome within sixty days and answer the charges against him. The Elector Frederic interposed his good offices, and at his request Pope Leo consented that Luther, instead of journeying to Rome, should come before the imperial diet of Augsburg, and have a conference with the Papal Legate, Cardinal *Cajetan*, one of the most

geticæ Conclusiones, embracing one hundred and seventy propositions. He also wrote, in answer to Eck's apology of the *Obelisci*, the *Defensio adv. Jo. Eckii monomachiam*, in *Löscher*, Pt. II.

[1] Cf. the Defence of Cochlæus by *Lessing*, but in a small matter only (Complete Works, edited by *Lachmann*, Berlin, 1838, sq., Vol. IV., pp. 87-101). *Otto*, Cochlæus as a Humanist. See also the defence of Pope Leo against *Bandello's* report, that the Pope had at first viewed this cause as a trifling matter, in the *Breslau Review* of Catholic Theology, ed. by *Ritter*, 1832, nros. I. and II.

[2] *Raynaldus*, Ad an. 1518, nro. 90.

[3] Resolutiones disput. de virt. indulgg. (*Löscher*, Vol. II., p. 183 sq.) (Tr.)

[4] *De Wette*, Vol. I, p. 119. (Tr.)

[5] In *Löscher*, Pt. II., p. 176; and *Meurer*, p. 68. (Tr.)

learned theologians of his age. In the early days of October, 1518, Luther, accompanied by some friends, entered Augsburg, and, fortified with a safe conduct from the Emperor Maximilian and the municipal authorities, presented himself before the Cardinal, who received him kindly, and was disposed to treat him with all possible tenderness. The Legate, having instructions to demand an unconditional retraction, refused to engage in controversy with Luther, who, claiming that he had said nothing contrary to the Holy Scriptures, to the teaching of the Church, the decrees of Popes, and the dictates of right reason,[1] was anxious to enter into a discussion for the purpose of defending his statement on Biblical authority. He nevertheless consented to subscribe to the following declaration: "I, Martin Luther, of the Order of St. Augustine, do reverence and obey the Roman Church in every word and deed, whether in time past, present, or future; and should I have said anything contrary to this profession or in a different sense, I desire that such speech shall be regarded as if never spoken."[2] Apprehensive of arrest and imprisonment, he, on the 20th of October, stealthily escaped from the city, and, liking himself to Isaias and St. Paul, "*appealed from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope better instructed*" (*a papa male informato ad papam melius informandum*).

That no one "might have a pretext to plead ignorance of the *true teaching of the Roman Church on indulgences*,"[3] Leo, in a Bull, issued November 9, 1518, and beginning *Cum postquam*, gave the fullest instruction on the doctrine, and threatened such as should gainsay it with excommunication *latæ sententiæ*. About the same time, the Pope sent the accomplished Saxon, *Charles of Miltitz*, to Germany, for the twofold purpose of decorating the Elector Frederic with the golden rose and the securing him in the interest of the Holy See; and of restraining Luther by peaceful measures until such time as the German bishops should have put an end to the quarrel. The Apostolic nuncio while travelling through Germany heard much complaint of the evil effects of Tetzel's preaching, and in consequence sharply rebuked the Dominican for indiscreet zeal. Tetzel took the reprimand so much to heart that he withdrew to a monastery, fell sick, and died, it is said, of grief, July 14, 1519. Miltitz was far more considerate

[1] *Luther's* German Works, Jena ed., Pt. I, fol. 107-136.

[2] *Luther's* Works, Altenburg ed., Pt. I., p. 132.

[3] In *Löscher*, Vol. II., p. 493 sq. *Walch's* ed. of Luther's Works, Pt. XV., p. 756 sq. In this Bull, it is said: "Romanum Pontificem—potestate clavium, quarum est aperire tollendo illius in Christi fidelibus impedimenta, culpam scil. et pœnam pro actualibus peccatis debitam, culpam quidem mediante sacramento pœnitentiæ, pœnam vero temporalem pro actualibus peccatis secundum divinam justitiam debitam mediante ecclesiastica indulgentia, posse pro rationalibus causis concedere eisdem Christi fidelibus,—sive in hac vita sint, sive in purgatorio, indulgentias ex superabundantia meritorum Jesu Christi et Sanctorum, ac tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis—thesaurum meritorum Jesu Christi et Sanctorum dispensare, per modum absolutionis indulgentiam ipsam conferre, vel per modum suffragii illam transferre consuevisse. Ac propterea omnes tam vivos quam defunctos, qui veracitur omnes indulgentias hujusmodi consecuti fuerint, a tanta temporali pœna secundum divinam justitiam pro peccatis suis actualibus debita liberari, quanta concessæ et acquisitæ indulgentiæ æquivalet." This authoritative instruction perfectly agrees with the doctrines of the Scholastics, given above, Vol. 2, pp. 572, 573, notes 5; 1, 2, 3.

in his treatment of his Saxon countryman, the author of the new teaching, and was deluded into the belief that his mission had been successful. The two had an *interview at Altenburg* (January 5, 1519), and Luther agreed to leave off preaching and live quietly if his adversaries would do likewise; to induce the people to continue obedient to the Holy See; to instruct them by letter in the orthodox sense on the veneration of the saints, on indulgences, purgatory, the Commandments of God, and the authority of the Pope; and, finally, to write to His Holiness in the spirit of a docile child. In a letter dated March 3, 1519, Luther wrote to the Pope as follows: "I have been unnecessarily, excessively, and abusively severe in my treatment of those empty babblers. I had only one end in view, viz., to prevent *Our Mother, the Roman Church*, from being soiled by the filth of another's avarice; and the faithful from being led into error, and learning to set indulgences before charity. Now, Most Holy Father, I protest before God and his creatures that *it has never been my purpose, nor is it now*, to do aught that might tend to weaken or overthrow the authority of the Roman Church or that of your Holiness; nay, more, I confess that the power of this Church is above all things; *that nothing in heaven or on earth is to be set before it*, Jesus alone, the Lord of all, excepted." That Luther was playing the part of a contemptible hypocrite, and did not mean a word of what he wrote to the Pope, is evident from a private letter written to his friend Spalatinus just nine days later (March 12).[1] "I whisper it to you," he writes, "in sooth I know not whether the Pope is Antichrist or his apostle."

The opponents of Luther, and notably *Dr. Eck*, without fully appreciating the consequences of their step, brought on a public discussion previously to the meeting of the German bishops in conference. Some who dreaded the agitation which a discussion of this character would certainly occasion, had their fears set at rest by the splendid reputation enjoyed by Eck[2] for ability and learning, and looked forward to a complete triumph. After the manner of the age, the subject-matter to be discussed was thrown into the form of *theses*.[3] The parties to the disputation, which took place in the hall of the Castle of Pleissenburg, at *Leipsig*, in the presence of *Duke George* of Saxony and a highly cultivated audience, and continued for two weeks

[1] *De Wette*, Tom. I., p. 239. (Tr.)

[2] *Eccii*, Epp. Ep. de rat. studior. suor. Ingol., 154, 4to. (*Strobel*, Misc. H. III., p. 95 sq.) *F. Kotgermund*, Erneu. Andenken, Vol. I., p. 251 sq. (Tr.)

[3] Among the most remarkable of these are the following:—

I. Man sins daily, and also daily repents, according to the precept of our Lord: Do penance. None but a just man (Eck) is exempt from this rule, he having no need of penance.

II. To deny that *man sins in doing good*, or that every sin is of its nature mortal, or, if *venial*, so only by the mercy of God, is all one with discarding Paul and Christ.

VII. To assert that *free will* is the arbiter of good or evil actions, or to deny that justification depends *on faith alone*, is silly nonsense.

XI. To affirm that indulgences are beneficial to Christians, or that they do not imply rather *an absence of good works*, is madness.

Carlstadt asserted in his VI. and VIII. theses that daily venial sins, like mortal, work eternal damnation.

together, were, on the one hand, Luther and Carlstadt, assisted by the professors of the University of Wittenberg, and on the other Eck and the professors of the Universities of Cologne, Louvain, and Leipsig. The chief propositions discussed were the doctrine of *the condition of man after the fall; of free will and grace; of penance and indulgences;* and of *the primacy of the Church of Rome.* Carlstadt,[1] who had been challenged by Eck, spoke first, maintaining that man of himself is incapable of doing any good work, and that even when in the state of grace his works are wholly destitute of merit.[2] This champion, who had placed the doctor's cap on Luther's head, suffered an ignominious defeat, and after a week's discussion was forced to yield his place to his disciple.[3]

The question of the primacy of the Pope came next under discussion, and Luther, in replying to Eck's argument for its *divine* origin, said that it rested only on human authority, and that of the passage from St. Matthew, xvi. 18, the words, "Thou art Peter," were addressed to the Apostle; and those immediately following, viz., "And upon this *rock* I will build My Church," applied to Christ. In the matter of jurisdiction, he went on to explain, the Pope has no advantage over the Archbishop of Magdeburg or the Bishop of Paris, and whatever supremacy he may enjoy is derived entirely from the sovereign will of the people. He is, indeed, he added, the head of the Apostolic College, and has a *primacy of honour, but not of jurisdiction.* Eck's superiority over his adversaries in knowledge, dialectical skill, and readiness and felicity of speech, secured him a brilliant triumph, and elicited the hearty applause of his hearers.[4]

In the course of the discussion, Luther had explicitly maintained that *faith alone,* independently of good works, suffices for salvation; and when confronted with conflicting passages from the Epistle of St. *James,* called in question the authenticity of this Epistle; denied human *free will,* the *primacy* of the Pope, and the *inerrancy* of Œcumenical Councils. The opinions advanced and advocated by him so nearly resembled the Hussite propositions branded as heretical by the Council of Constance, that the Duke of Saxony, startled by their boldness, hastily put an end to the discussion, remarking, "*Here, indeed, is a fruitful source of danger.*"[5]

[1] His real name was Andrew of Bodenstein; he took that of Carlstadt from his birthplace, in Franconia. Using the initials of these three words, Melanchthon called him the bad A B C.

[2] *A. G. Diekhoff,* De Carolost. Luth. de servo arbitrio doctrinæ defensore, Gott., 1850. (Tr.)

[3] Life of M. Luther, by *Audin,* Phil., 1841, p. 97; London, 1854, Vol. I., p. 182.

[4] *Lutheri,* Ep. ad Spalat.: "Interim tamen ille placet, triumphat et regnat: sed donec ediderimus nos nostra. Nam quia male disputatum est, edam resolutiones denuo.—Lipsienses sane nos neque salutarunt neque visitarunt ac veluti hostes invisissimos habuerunt, illum comitabantur, adhærebant, convivabantur, invitabant, denique tunica donaverunt et schamlotum addiderunt, cum ipso spaciatum equitaverunt, breviter quidquid potuerunt, in nostram injuriam tentaverunt." Acta colloq. Lips. (between Eck, Melanchthon, Cellarius, and Carlstadt, many rejoinders, etc.) in *Löscher,* Vol. III., p. 203 sq. *Walch,* Vol. XV., p. 954 sq. *Seidemann,* The Leipsig Disputation, A. D. 1519, from hitherto unexplored sources, Dresden, 1843.

[5] The official report of this disputation is in *Löscher,* Vol. III., pp. 203-558; *Walch*

A new adversary to Luther, but less formidable than Eck, now came forth in the person of *Jerome Emser* of Leipsig, a licentiate of canon law, and private secretary to Duke George of Saxony. He was an excellent scholar, possessed a good knowledge of the ancient and Oriental languages, was brilliant and caustic in repartee, and withal a man of extraordinary erudition.[1] By mutual agreement, their discussion was to be reported, collected, and sent to the Universities of *Erfurt* and *Paris*, whose authorities were to decide on the merits of the respective arguments, and, pending the decision, no aggressive steps were to be taken by either side. Luther and his friends disregarded the pledge, and a fresh controversial war broke out.

Notwithstanding that Luther had been completely beaten in the great disputation in the Pleissenburg at Leipsig, he gained the solid advantage of giving publicity to his cause, and heightening its importance in the estimation of the populace. The questions in dispute were now in every mouth. It was in the theological congress that Luther gained to his side the most important of his disciples. This was *Philip Melanchthon* ("Schwarzerd," i. e., Blackearth).[2] His father was a skilled armourer of Bretten, in the Palatinate of the Rhine, where Philip was born, February 16, 1497, and the famous Reuchlin was his uncle. After making an excellent course of preparatory studies at Pforzheim and afterwards at Heidelberg, where he took the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy in 1512, he went in the same year to Tübingen, completed his scientific studies, and, in 1513, published a Greek grammar, took his degree of Master of Arts in 1514, and began to give lectures on the classics and Aristotelian philosophy. He was accounted a literary prodigy, and his name and accomplishments were the theme of every tongue. More gentle, moderate, and prudent than Luther, he lacked his master's energy, strength of character, depth of feeling, magnetic influence, and vigour of speech. Still, he rendered very essential service to Luther, who was not unfrequently guided by his counsels. When a little more than twenty-one years of age (August 29, 1518), he was appointed, through the recommenda-

Works of Luther, Vol. XV., p. 998 sq., and in *De Wette*, Letters of Luther, Vol. I. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., pp. 80-94; 2nd ed., p. 134 sq. *Wiedemann*, John Eck, pp. 75-139; and "*The Catholic*," year 1872, in several articles from September onwards.

[1] *Hieron. Emser*, De disputatione Lipsiensi quantum ad Bœmos obiter deflexa est, in August, 1519. In answer to Luther's Ad Ægocerotem Emserianum M. Lutheri responsio, Emser wrote A venatione Lutheriana Ægocerotis assertio in November, 1518 (*Lutheri*, Opp. lat. Jen., T. I., *Löscher*, Vol. III.) Why the interpretation of Luther had been forbidden to the common people (sc. because it contained fourteen hundred lies and heretical errors.) Lps., 1523. German translation of the New Testament, Dresden, 1527; Assertio Missæ; De Canone Missæ; and still earlier, De vita et miraculis S. Bennonis. Cf. the *Aschbach* and *Freiburg* Cyclopædias, art. "Emser."

[2] *Melanchthon*, Opp., Basil., 1541 sq., 5 T. in fol., recensuit *Peucer*, Vitenbergæ, 1562 sq., 4 T. fol., and commenced in the Corpus Reformator., ed. *Bretschneider*, T. I.-X., Melanchthon. opp., Hal., 1834-42, 4to.—*Camerarius*, De Ph. Mel. ortu, totius vitæ curric. et morte narratio, Lps., 1566, ed. *Augusti*, Vrat., 1817. *Matthes*, The Life of Philip Melanchthon, from the Sources, Altenburg, 1841; 2nd ed., 1846. *Galle*, Melanchthon considered as a Theologian, and the Development of his doctrine, Halle, 1840. *Heppe*, 2nd ed., Marburg, 1860. *Planck*, Melanchthon, præceptor Germ., Nördl., 1860. *C. Schmidt*, Life and select Writings of Melanchthon, Elberfeld, 1861.

tion of Erasmus, professor of Greek language and literature at *Wittenberg*. An intimacy soon sprung up between himself and Luther, for whom he had always a great respect, and in whose defence he wrote an apology.[1] Elated with the adulation of his young friend, and encouraged by the Hussites, with whom he had lately opened a correspondence,[2] Luther soon forgot his humiliating defeat at Leipsig, put aside all disguise, stifled any lingering feelings of reverence for the Church of Rome, and laid bare to the world a heart which had so long nourished a fierce and fiery spirit of revolt.

It had been agreed that the arguments advanced by both sides in the Leipsig disputation should be submitted before publication to the judgment of the theological faculties of the Universities of Paris, Louvain, and Cologne. The decisions, rendered in the months of August and November, 1519, were adverse to Luther; his teaching was unanimously condemned. Immediately on learning the result, he poured forth upon the members of these faculties, whom but a little while before he had called his masters in theology, a torrent of savage and abusive invective.[3]

The movements of Miltitz could not keep pace with the impetuous energy of Luther, who, wearying of the Nuncio's tardiness, despatched to Leo a letter, dated October 11, 1520, accompanied with his treatise on *Christian Liberty*, dedicated to the Pope. In this letter, he pours out all the venon of his soul against Rome, and flings the coarsest insults at the Pope. Here is a specimen: "It were a blessing for you (Leo) to lay down the office of the Papacy, which only your most depraved enemies can exultingly represent as an honour, and live upon the trifling income of a priest or your hereditary fortune. Only children of perdition, like Judas Iscariot and his imitators, should revel in the honours of which you are the object."[4] The coarse, indecent tone of this letter would of itself have justified the sentence, already passed upon Luther through the representations of Eck, if it had been more severe than it was. Luther, anticipating the blow and fearing its consequences, *had recourse to his usual cunning and dexterity when such calamities impended,* and sought to rob the papal condemnation of its terrors in the eyes of the people by largely circulating his Sermon on Excommunication.

[1] Defensio Melanchthonis contra Eccium, prof. theologiæ., Melanchthon either forgot or disregarded the promise of his master, and published at Wittenberg a letter addressed to Œcolampadius, giving a summary of the discussion at Leipsig, but at the same time recognising the fine talents of Eck. *Audin*, L. c., p. 106 (Phil., 1841); Eng. ed. (London, 1854), Vol. I., p. 209. (Tr.)

[2] *Löscher*, Vol. III., p. 699 sq. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 88 sq.; 2nd ed., p. 151 sq.

[3] Luther's Works, *Walch's* ed., Vol. XV., p. 1598 sq.

[4] Luther's Works, *Walch's* ed., Vol. XV., p. 934 sq.; *De Wette*, Vol. I., p. 497 sq. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 151 sq.; 2nd ed., p. 221 sq.

§ 301. *Fresh Writings of Luther—Affinity of His Religious System to the Code of the Robber Knights and the Principles of Paganism.*

Moehler, Symbolism (1832), 6th ed., Mentz, 1843, Engl. transl. †*Hilgers*, Theology of Symbolism, Bonn, 1841. *Riffel*, 2nd ed., Vol. I., p. 28 sq. *Staudenmaier*, Philos. of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 684 sq. *Stöckl*, Hist of the Philosophy of the M. A., Vol. III., p. 477 sq. Cf. also "Luther, considered as the solution of a psychological problem" (Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vols. II. and III.) *Vorreiter*, Luther's struggle with the anti-Christian principles of the Revolution, Halle, 1861.

Luther had not yet formally declared his opposition to the Church; but he soon spoke out emphatically and unmistakably against both her and her authority. During the years 1520 and 1521, he displayed an astonishing literary activity. It would seem that he would have the world bow to his *ipse dixit*. He would brook no contradiction; whoever would set himself against him must be prepared for a death-struggle; he spared no one. His *religious* system was a *pantheistical mysticism*—not indeed the outcome of his controversy on indulgences, but the result of his *youthful stubbornness* and perversity, and of his subsequent *wayward and erratic religious exercises*. It combined in one complex organism the errors of the *Gnostics*, Cathari, Waldenses; of the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit, and the Apostolic Brethren; of Amalric of Bena, Master Eckhart, Wickliffe, Huss, and the author of the "German Theology," who, all of them, because they were sectaries, have been represented by Protestant authors as the forerunners of the pseudo-Reformers.[1] Such is the system which, it was claimed, has its full and adequate sanction in Holy Scripture. It teaches that the Bible is the *only source* of faith; ascribes to it the *completest inspiration*, extending to every word, and invests the reading of it with a *quasi-sacramental character*. Its leading tenets were the following: *Human nature* has been wholly corrupted by original sin, and hence man is born *without a trace of freedom*. Whatever he does, be it good or ill, is not *his own*, but God's work. *Faith alone* works justification, and man is saved by confidently believing that God, who covereth sins and doth not impute them to man (Ps. xxxi. 1, 2), will pardon him. This proposition is one wonderfully fruitful in consequences, inasmuch as it secures man a full pardon of his sins, and an unconditional release from the punishment due to them. Its scope is so comprehensive, and its conditions so easy, that no Pope has ever pretended to lay claim to anything at all comparable to it.[2] The

[1] The name of Reformer was first applied to these men by *Luther* in his preface to the German Theology. It was also adopted by *Flacius Illyricus*, Catalog. testium veritatis. *G. Arnold*, Historia et descriptio theol. myst., Francof., 1702, p. 306; *Flathe*, Hist. of the forerunners of the Reformation, etc.

[2] When charged with having arbitrarily introduced the word *sola* into Rom. iii. 28, he made the following defence: "Should your Pope give himself any useless annoyance about the word *sola*, you may promptly reply: It is the will of Dr. Martin Luther that it should be so. He says that '*Pope and jackass are synonymous terms.*' We are the masters of the papists, not their schoolboys and disciples, and will not be dictated to by them." (Altona ed., T. V., fol. 2690.)—"As many as *believe* in Christ, be they as numerous and wicked as may be, will be neither responsible for their works nor condemned on account of them."—"*Unbelief* is the only sin man can be guilty of; whenever the name

hierarchy and the *priesthood* are unnecessary, and exterior worship is useless. To clothe one's body in sacred and priestly garments; to be bodily present in church and busy one's self about holy things; to pray, to fast, to keep watch, or to go through other good works of any sort whatever to the end of time, all these avail the soul nothing. All Sacraments, excepting Baptism, Holy Eucharist, and Penance, are rejected, and even these, if withheld, may be supplied by faith.[1] There is a universal priesthood; every Christian may assume that office; there is no need of a special body of men set apart and ordained to dispense the mysteries of God, and, as a consequence, no *visible Church* or special means established by God whereby man may work out his salvation.[2]

The idea of a *universal priesthood*, so flattering to the bulk of the people, was set forth with special prominence and emphasis in his more inflammatory writings, such as the "*Address to the Christian Nobles of Germany*," "*On the Improvement of Christian Morality*," "*On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church*," addressed to the clergy, and on "*Christian Liberty*," addressed to the laity. In these he called upon the emperor to subvert the power of the Pope, to confiscate for his own use investitures and the goods of the Church, to do away with ecclesiastical feasts and holidays, and, finally, to abolish Masses for the dead; for the latter, he said, were designed to supply the means of "feasting and revelry." Luther was encouraged to put forward these startling doctrines in bold and aggressive language by the powerful *Knights of the Empire*, who, he said, in the fatalistic language so accordant with his views, were sent of heaven for his defence.[3] He was now in bad company, and, quite contrary to his deep religious convictions and feelings, found himself obliged to fall in with the views of men who were pagan at heart, and whose ultimate aims were dia-

of sin is applied to other acts, it is a misnomer; such acts are of a piece with those of little Johnny or Maudlin, when they retire to a corner to relieve nature; people may laugh at them, but will add—well done."—"In this way does *faith* destroy any bad odour our filth may emit" (Family Bible with Commentary, Jena ed., 1565; Sermon on the text: "So much hath God loved the world.")—"Provided one have faith, adultery is no sin; but should one be destitute of faith, even though he honour God, he is guilty of a wholly idolatrous act."

[1] "*Let all men be free as to the Sacraments;* if one does not wish to be baptized, he need not; he may, if he likes, refuse to receive the Sacraments; he has authority from God not to confess, if he dislikes to do so" (Treatise on Confession). In the early days of his career as a reformer, Luther certainly held that the Sacraments are optional; he, however, retracted this teaching, after Carlstadt had pushed his principles to their legitimate conclusions.

[2] "All Christians enjoy in common the spiritual priesthood, and may take on them the office of preaching in its true sense; we are all priests in Christ; all have power and authority to judge.—Every Christian is a *father*, a *confessor* of the heavenly ordained confession, an office which the Pope arrogates to himself, as he also does in the matter of the keys, the episcopate, and everything else—oh, the Robber! Nay, I will go still further, and say, let no one secretly confess to a priest *as such*, but as to one like himself, as to a brother and a Christian."

[3] Luther returned the following answer to a letter of Sylvester of Schaumburg: "Quod ut non contemno, ita nolo nisi Christo protectore niti, qui forte et hunc ei spiritum (of assisting him) dedit." *De Wette*, Vol. I., p. 448.

metrically opposed to his own. One of these was *Ulrich von Hutten*,[1] the descendant of an ancient and knightly house in Franconia. Destined by his parents for the ecclesiastical state, he was sent to the cloister-school of Fulda, and, catching the spirit of the age, applied himself with enthusiastic fervour to the study of the pagan classics. He became a fine classical scholar, but at the expense of his faith and his virtue. He fled from the monastery; led for many years a life of shameless debauchery, and, disregardful of the commonest rules of decency, which even a libertine respects, gave a detailed account in elegant Latin verse of the progress of a loathsome disease brought on by his excesses. By turn a soldier, a pamphleteer, and a poet; always dreaded and sometimes admired; ever seeking out an occasion to display his powers, he was glad when an opportunity was given him of taking part in the quarrel between Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn. Words failed him to express his fulsome praises of the former, or to adequately convey the torrent of invective and libellous abuse which he belched forth against the latter, and applied indiscriminately to the whole body of the clergy (*Triumphus Capnionis*). Besides openly and publicly proclaiming that he was in league with twenty free-thinkers for the avowed purpose of extirpating the monks, this vaunted advocate of liberty and humanity did not blush to detail, with a refinement of cruelty that would have chilled the heart of a headsman, the tortures and manner of death it would gladden his soul to see the baptized Jew Pfefferkorn undergo, and for no other reason than because the latter had been the first to call the attention of the Church to certain Hebrew books of a dangerous tendency. Like Luther, he shortly left off the use of the Latin, a language which he had hitherto employed, and in its place substituted the *German*, as a more convenient and efficient vehicle for revolutionising thoughts. "It has been my wont," he said, "in the past to employ the Latin language exclusively; but in so doing I reached only a few, whereas I *now appeal to my country*." He closed his life on the island of Ufenau, in the Lake of Zürich. The work, which gave special notoriety to this league, was the pamphlet entitled "*Epistolæ virorum obscurorum*,"[2] directed against the monks, published together with *Lorenzo Valla's* book "On the Fictitious Donation of Constantine the Great to Pope Sylvester," and preceded by an ironical dedication to Pope Leo X.[3] These caustic satires and malignant lampoons, containing offensive and obscene illustrations by the celebrated *Luke Cranach*, were openly offered for

[1] Opp. ed. **Bœcking*, Lips., 1859 sq. *Weislinger*, Huttenus delarvatus, Constantiæ, 1730. *Panzer*, Ulrich of Hutten with reference to literature, Nürnberg, 1798. *David Strauss*, Ulrich of Hutten, Lps., 1858 sq., 3 vols. Cf. Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. 45. *Meiners*, Biography of celebrated men in the times of the Renaissance, Zürich, 1796-97, 3 vols. He likewise speaks of *Francis of Sickingen* (Vol. III.); Cf. *Hub. Leodii*, Lib. de rebus gestis et calamitoso obitu Fr. de Sickingen (*Freher*, T. III., p. 295). *C. Ferd. Meyer* (of Zürich), The last days of Hutten's Life, being "a work of fiction," Lps., 1872.

[2] See p. 140, note 3.

[3] Conf. *Kampschulte*, The University of Erfurt, Pt. I., pp. 192-226

sale at the church-doors side by side with books of devotion.[1] No means were neglected by Hutten and his party for the accomplishment of their purposes. To give the monks a more complete overthrow, they sought the alliance of princes. "We must," said Hutten in a letter to *Perkheimer*, "employ every means to gain them; we must never leave off pressing our suit; we must accept from them offices public and private, for it is thus jurists and theologians secure and retain their favour." Hence we see that previously to Luther's expulsion from the Church, a league had been formed, having nothing in common with the pseudo-mystical tendencies of the so-called reformer; but, on the contrary, wholly pagan in character, and representing a radically materialistic reaction against the Church, her religious system, and her deposit of revealed truths.[2] There was but one bond that could unite these parties, whose principles, at least in their origin, were diametrically opposed—the one claiming to be purely spiritual, and the other known to be essentially materialistic in its aims—and that was the *common bond of hatred* against the Church.

Hutten, by birth a Knight of the Empire, well knew how to excite in the hearts of the nobles, who, though they had long plundered the property of the Church, had never ventured to resist her authority, a spirit of hatred against the clergy as violent as had ever been entertained by the Humanists and philologists. The warlike habits of these knights had obliterated every principle of justice from their minds, and stifled every humane feeling. Their maxim was: "To ride and to rob is no shame; the best in the land do the same." They also ingeniously professed to believe that the wealth of such low fellows as commercial men was the lawful plunder of nobles. All these distinguishing characteristics of the nobility of the empire were combined and obtained their fullest expression in *Francis of Sickingen*, a most complete specimen of the degeneracy into which the chivalry of the age had fallen. Putting aside all restraints to the widest freedom of action, his conduct was no longer the result of that exalted standard of virtue, which, in preceding ages, where chivalry, whether in the service of the Church or the Empire, was wholly devoted to the interests and advancement of truth, justice, and religion, was its crowning glory. His aims were selfish, and his motives sordid. He was ever ready to draw his sword in the most iniquitous of causes when such gave promise of pecuniary reward. His ability as a military leader recommended him to Francis I. and Charles V., who were at times rivals for his services. He was, by turn, under the ban of the

[1] Satires and Pasquinades of the age of the Reformation, published by *Oscar Schade*, Hanov., 1856-58, 3 vols. Unpleasant for many a Protestant: *Dr. Thomas Murner* (Franciscan of Strasburg's) Poem of the Great Lutheran Fool, published by *Dr. Henry Kurz*, Zürich, 1848. Vilmar, in his History of German Literature, says of it: "It is the most important satirical writing that ever appeared on the Reformation."

[2] The articles: Luther's Alliance with the Aristocracy of the Empire, and preparations for the war of Sickingen. (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. IV., pp. 465-482; pp. 577-593; pp. 669-678; pp. 725-732.)

empire as a disturber of the public peace, and high in the imperial favour as a commander of armies. *To the material force, of which he was the representative, inveterately and persistently hostile to public order, did Luther address himself.* Sickingen, however, cared as little as Hutten for the religious opinions of Luther. He encouraged the controversy on indulgences, and favoured the revolt against the Church to which it led, only because these supplied an occasion to work mischief and furnished a means of inciting the masses to rebellion, thereby bringing about the revolution he was meditating against the empire. Although an agitator, a revolutionist, and a disturber of the public peace, he was never in sympathy with Luther, and continued to the last steadfast in his fidelity to the Catholic Church. At his prayer, Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, by an instrument, dated May 10, 1520, authorized the erection and endowment of a chapel, and granted an indulgence of forty days to all who should visit it. He had also the intention, in 1519, of founding a Franciscan convent, but was driven from his purpose by the sneers of Hutten. Though Hutten's caustic raillery might deter Sickingen from founding a religious house, his influence could not draw him to the cause of Luther. "Who is he," was his reply to the suggestion, "that dares attempt to overthrow institutions which have survived to the present day? If such there be, and he have the requisite courage for the undertaking, does he not lack the power?"

§ 302. *Luther's Condemnation.*

Shortly after the close of the disputation of Leipsig, Dr. Eck set out for Rome, in order by his presence to urge Leo to take more prompt and decisive measures than might be looked for from the dilatory and over-cautious policy of Miltitz. He had many difficulties to face and much opposition to overcome in the Consistory, but his appeals and representations were in the end successful. The bull, "*Exsurge Domine et judica causam tuam,*"[1] was issued June 15, 1520, in which forty-one propositions, extracted from the writings of Luther, were condemned, his works ordered to be burned wherever found, and he himself excommunicated if he should not have retracted at the expiration of sixty days. The Pope exhorted and prayed him and his followers by the Blood of Christ, shed for the redemption of man and the foundation of the Church, to cease to disturb the peace of the Spouse of Christ, to destroy her unity, and outrage her sacred and unchangeable truths. But should he disregard these entreaties, refuse to avail himself of this paternal kindness and tenderness, and persist

[1] This bull, composed by Card. Ascolti, is written in pure, graceful, and elegant Latinity. *Audin*, L. c., London, 1854, Vol. I., p. 224. It is given in *Harduin*, Collectio conc., T. IX., p. 1891; in *Coquellinus*, Bullarium, T. III., Pt. III., p. 487 sq. *Raynald*, Ad. an. 1520; Concil. Trid. ed., Lps., 1842, p. 270-72. In German, with the carping observations of *Hutten;* in *Walch*, Vol. XV., p. 1691 sq. Luther wrote against this bull: Reasons and Causes in favour of all those who have been unjustly condemned by the Roman Bull, Germ. Works, Jena ed., Pt. I., p. 400-432.

in his errors, he was declared excommunicate, liable to the penalties attached to the crime of heresy, and all Christian princes were instructed to apprehend him and send him to Rome. The execution of this bull was given to the Papal Legates, Carraccioli and Aleandro, and to these Dr. Eck was joined. That one like Eck, holding no superior rank as a churchman, should have been made a member of this commission, of itself gave no little offence. But apart from this, he had been and was still Luther's most formidable and implacable enemy; and he was now the bearer of his sentence. Luther considered that, under the circumstances, the acceptance by him of so ungracious an office, was clear evidence of personal vindictiveness. His own condemnation, coming to him through such a source, he regarded, says *Pallavicini*, as a stealthy stab from the poniard of a malignant foe, rather than a lawfully authorized blow from a Roman lictor's axe. Hence, to represent Eck's successful journey beyond the Alps as undertaken from motives of revenge, and as being in some sort an encroachment upon the rights of the German bishops, was not a difficult task. Moreover, *it is said*, that Eck of his own authority extended the excommunication to many of Luther's adherents, and among them *Carlstadt* and *Dolcius*, professors at Wittenberg; *Pirkheimer* and *Spengler*, councillors of Nürnberg; and *Adelmannsfelden*, a nobleman and canon of Augsburg. The last circumstance put many obstacles in the way of publishing the bull and carrying its instructions into execution, particularly in districts where public feeling ran high. Luther, with his usual dexterity, hastened to counteract the effect it might have upon the public mind by publishing his pamphlet *On the New Eckian Bulls*.[1] Eck was insulted at Leipsig, and forced to seek safety in flight, and the Papal bull was made the jest of the populace. Similar outbreaks took place at Erfurt. But at Mentz, Cologne, Halberstadt, Freisingen, Eichstædt, Merseburg, Meissen, Brandenburg, and other places, the bull was published, and Luther's writings burned. The Elector of Saxony ordered Luther to communicate once more with the Pope. Luther complied, but his tone was far from conciliatory. He forwarded to Leo his pamphlet *On the New Eckian Bulls*, accompanied with his discourse on *Christian Liberty*.

Charles V., son of Philip the Fair, who, when only twenty years of age, and after a sharp contest with foreign competitors, had succeeded his grandfather Maximilian as emperor, besides having inherited the ancient attachment of the House of Hapsburg to the traditional teachings of the Church, had received strong religious impressions from his preceptor, Adrian of Utrecht, whom he afterwards was instrumental in raising to the papal throne.[2] After his

[1] In *Riffel* (2nd ed.), Vol. I., p. 242; 1st ed., Vol. I., p. 170 sq.

[2] *Lang*, Correspondence of Emperor Charles V., published from the Royal Library and the Bibliothèque de Bourgoigne, at Brussels, Lps., 1844 sq., 6 vols. *Heine*, Letters addressed to Charles V. (1530-32) by his Father Confessor, from the Spanish Royal archives at Simancas, Brl., 1848. *Autobiography* of Charles V. in a Portuguese translation, rediscovered at Brussels by *Kervin de Lettenhove*. German, by *Warnkœnig*, Brussels, 1862.

coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle (October 22, 1520), the bull excommunicating Luther was placed in his hands by the Legates, Carraccioli and Aleandro. Luther was as yet uncertain as to the temper of the new emperor and the course he would pursue. Hoping to secure his good-will, he addressed him a *most humble* letter,[1] in which, among other things, he stated that in publishing his pamphlets he had no aim in view other than to brush away superstitious notions and the delusions of human tradition, and establish in their stead the truths of the Gospel. And for this, he went on to say, have I endured these *three* years the angry abuse of men and every sort of evil. He concluded by stating that he had in vain sued for mercy and implored pardon; his enemies had made up their minds to it that the Gospel, divine truth, and himself should perish together; to avert so great an evil, he, like Athanasius of old, invoked the emperor's protection.

The Elector of Saxony, who had come as far as the Rhine to welcome the emperor on his arrival, had a conference with *Erasmus* at Cologne, in the course of which the latter gave it as his opinion that Luther's fault chiefly consisted in his having aimed a blow at the tiara of the Pope and the bellies of the monks. The judgment had certainly the merit of being brief and pointed; but to be merry on so grave and momentous a subject was unseemly, and little to the credit of Erasmus. Nevertheless, on the strength of it, the elector demanded that the legates should submit the whole matter for examination to a court, composed of sober, religious, and impartial men; and that Luther's teachings should be disproved *by authority of Scripture.* Luther, now spurning papal prohibitions, and notably that of Paul II. in the bull *Exsecrabilis,* and without waiting for an answer from Leo, appealed (November 17, 1520), on the authority of the decrees of Constance, declaring a Council superior to the Pope, from the Holy See to an Œcumenical Synod; after having previously published, on the 4th of the same month, his violent protest "*Against the Execrable Bull of Antichrist.*" Not content with these bold and aggressive acts, he went still further, and on December 10, 1520, having called together the students of the university and the inhabitants of Wittenberg at the Elster or Eastern Gate of the city, where fagots had been heaped up, ready to be set on fire, he appeared bearing the bull of Leo, printed in characters large enough to be seen by all present. The Body of Canon Law, many scholastic and casuistical works, the controversial writings of Eck (the Chrysoprasus, etc.) and

Conf. *Hist.* and *Political* Papers, Vol. 50, p. 857 sq., and *Ranke,* Complete Works, Vol. VI., p. 73 sq. *Robertson,* History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V., Edinburgh, 1769; Vienna, 1787, 4 vols. Favourable Portraiture of Charles V., in *Raumer,* Hist. of Europe from the end of the fifteenth century, Vol. I., passim, particularly p. 580-586; rather unfavourable because partial representation by *Maurenbrecher,* Charles V. and the German Protestants from 1545 to 1555, together with an appendix of *documents* drawn from the Spanish archives of Simancas, Düsseldorf, 1865. Conf. *Reusch,* Review of Theology, Bonn, 1866, p. 817-824.

[1] In *Walch,* Luther's Works, Vol. XV., p. 1636. Cf. *Riffel,* Vol. 1, p. 103 sq.

Emser, were first cast into the flames,[1] after which Luther flung the Pope's bull into the pile, exclaiming: "Thou hast disturbed the Lord's Holy One, therefore shalt thou be consigned to fire eternal." As Luther had already given public notice by posters of what he intended to do with the bull, now that the work was accomplished he hastened to announce his triumph to Spalatinus.[2] On the following day he addressed the students, saying: "It is now full time that the Pope himself were burned. My meaning is," he went on to say, "that the Papal Chair, its false teachings and abominations, should be committed to the flames." The emperor, sensible that matters were going from bad to worse, convoked his first diet at Worms.

§ 303. *The Diet of Worms*, 1521—*Luther at Wartburg.*

Cochlæus (Col. 1568), p. 55 sq, *Pallavicini*, Hist. conc. Trid., lib. I., c. 25. *Sarpi*, Hist. conc. Trid., lib. I., c. 21 sq.—Acta *Lutheri* in conciliis Vormat. ed. Policarius, Vit., 1546 (Luth. opp. lat. Jenæ, T. II., p. 436 sq. German Works, Jena ed., Pt. I., p. 432-463), *Raynald.*, Ad an., 1521. *Walz*, The Diet of Worms, 1521 (Researches on German Hist., VIII., 21-44); *Friedrich*, The Diet at Worms, 1521, according to letters of *Aleander* (in the Debates of the Royal Acad. of Sciences of Bavaria, Class III., Vol. XI., year 1870, sect. 3). *Riffel*, Vol. I., 2nd ed., p. 224 sq.

The emperor had at first intended to summon Luther before the diet. Aleandro objected, because, to submit to the discussion of a secular court questions which had been already disposed of by the Holy See and their author excommunicated, he regarded as disgraceful. His words had much weight in Germany, because, though a Lombard by birth, he was popularly believed to be a German; and his lectures in Paris on Greek literature and Ausonius, delivered before two thousand hearers, had given him name and influence with the Humanists. He demanded that the provisions of the bull against Luther should be fully carried out (January 3, 1521).

The evil effects of centralising all ecclesiastical authority in Rome, on the one hand, and on the other, *of leaving off holding ecclesiastical synods* in Germany, before which the questions raised by Luther should have been brought, were now painfully apparent.[3] The emperor was not fully alive to the scope and importance of the questions involved in the controversy until after the legate had clearly pointed out that Luther's attitude towards the Holy See threatened, not only the stability of the Church, but the very existence of the empire and the well-being of society. The States, however, refused to yield to Aleandro's demand; for having themselves brought forward *one hundred and one Grievances* (*Gravamina*) touching abuses in ecclesiastical affairs,[4] they were unwilling to condemn Luther without a hearing. Moreover, George, Duke of Saxony, a determined enemy of Luther's,

[1] *Audin*, L. c. (London, 1854), Vol. I., p. 234. (Tr.)

[2] Lutheri ep. ad Spalat.: "Impossibile est enim salvos fieri, qui huic bullæ foverunt aut non repugnarunt" (*De Wette*, Vol. I., p. 522).

[3] Cf. *Wiedemann*, John Eck, p. 137 and p. 385.

[4] *Walch*, Luther's Works, Vol. XV., p. 2058, sq.

brought before the diet *twelve specific complaints*, including some against the abuse of indulgences and the lax morals of the clergy. He also strenuously advocated the holding of an Œcumenical Council.

Luther, in the meantime, ordered his conduct to suit the circumstances, now professing himself humble and submissive, and again haughtily proclaiming his intention of holding out against all opposition. Influenced more by the emperor's safe-conduct and the assistance promised from another quarter, than by reliance on Divine aid, he finally made up his mind to go to Worms, where he arrived April 16. Under the circumstances, it required no special tax upon his courage to write to Spalatinus, as if apprehensive of the fate of Huss: "Yes, I shall go to Worms, even if there were as many devils there as there are tiles on the roofs of Wittenberg." Luther went before the imperial diet, where the emperor was present, on the 17th and 18th of April.

On the former of these days, *John Von Eck*, Chancellor to the Archbishop of Treves, pointing to close upon twenty volumes placed upon a table near by, asked Luther, first, if he acknowledged himself the author of these writings published under his name; and, secondly, if he was willing to retract the teachings contained therein. After hearing the titles of the books read, Luther, in answer to the first question, admitted their authorship, but requested time for consideration before answering the second. A day was given him to prepare his reply, and on the morrow the chancellor again asked him if he would retract. Luther was evasive. The chancellor pressed for a categorical answer. "Will you or will you not retract?" said he, addressing him. Luther replied: "Inasmuch as it is certain that both Popes and councils have time and again fallen into error, and denied at one time what they had affirmed at another, I cannot bring myself to put faith in them. My conscience is captive to the words of God, and unless I shall be convicted of error by scripture proof or by plain reason, I neither can nor will retract anything. God help me. Amen."[1]

At a subsequent conference, *Dr. John von Eck*, the Chancellor, and *Cochlæus*, Dean of the Church of the Holy Virgin at Frankfort, pointed out to Luther that he was inconsistent and *ex-parte* in his appeal to Holy Scripture—first, because he would accept no rule of interpretation but *his own private judgment*, and, next, because of arbitrarily rejecting certain Books, he had virtually called in question the authority of all.[2] They further reminded him that the authors of every

[1] The dramatic words hitherto attributed to him: "Here I stand, how else can I act?" are a later edition. Cf. *Burkhardt*, Studies and Criticisms, 1869, nro. 3.

[2] This is the style in which Luther speaks of the Pentateuch: "We have no wish either to see or hear Moses. Let us leave Moses to the Jews, to whom he was given to serve as a *Mirror of Saxony*; he has nothing in common with Pagans and Christians, and we should take no notice of him. Just as France esteems the *Mirror of Saxony* only in so far as it is the expression of natural law, so also the Mosaic legislation, though admirably suited to the Jews, has no binding force whatever as regards ourselves. Moses is the prince and exemplar of all executioners; in striking terror into the hearts of men, in inflicting torture,

heresy that had rent the Church from the earliest days to their own, had sought in scripture the justification of their errors. But their arguments and the entreaties of *Cochlaeus*, who visited him privately some days later, were all to no purpose. "Even if I should retract," said he, "the *others* (*Humanists*), men far more learned than myself, would not keep silence or cease to carry on the work."[1] A committee, composed of princes and bishops, and including, besides others, Drs. Eck and Cochlæus, advised Luther to submit to the judgment of a general council; but the monk was inexorable. To the Archbishop of Treves, *Richard von Greifenklau*, who requested him to suggest his own method of adjusting matters, he replied by quoting the words of Gamaliel: "If this work be of man, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it." Apart from his obstinate adherence to his errors, and his rejection of every overture looking towards an authoritative decision, Luther had given much offence by his bibulous habits and his unseemly familiarities with females;[2] and, on the day after his conference with the Archbishop of Treves (April 26), being provided with a safe-conduct for twenty-one days, was ordered to quit Worms. His ostensible destination was Wittenberg: but while on his way, and probably by preconcerted arrangement[3] between himself and the Elector of Saxony, he was set upon by five masked and armed men, seized and carried away a willing prisoner to the Castle of *Wartburg*, near *Eisenach*, where he remained from May, 1521, till March 8, 1522, living incognito under the assumed name of Younker George, and dressed as a knight. On the 26th of May, when many of the States had already, as it seems unadvisedly,

and in tyrannising, he is without a rival." . . . Of Ecclesiastes, the Heresiarch says: "This book should be more complete; it is mutilated; it is like a cavalier riding without boots or spurs, just as I used to do while I was still a monk." . . . Of Judith and Tobias: "As it seems to me, Judith is a tragedy, in which the end of all tyrants may be learned. As to Tobias, it is a comedy, in which there is a great deal of talk about women. It contains many amusing and silly stories." . . . Of Ecclesiasticus: "The author of this book is an excellent expounder of the law, or a jurist; he also gives good precepts for exterior deportment; but he is not a prophet, and knows simply nothing about Christ." . . . Of the Second Machabees: "I have so great an aversion to this book, and that of Esther, that I almost wish they did not exist; they are full of observances characteristically Jewish and of Pagan abominations." . . . Of the Four Gospels: "The first three speak of the works of our Lord, rather than of his oral teaching; that of St. John is the only sympathetic, the only true Gospel, and should be undoubtedly preferred to the others. In like manner, the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Paul are superior to the first three Gospels." . . . Of the Epistles to the Hebrews: "It need not surprise one to find here bits of wood, hay, and straw." . . . Of the Epistle of St. James: "Compared with the Epistles of St. Paul, this is in truth an epistle of straw; it contains absolutely nothing to remind one of the style of the Gospel." . . . Of the Apocalypse: "There are many things objectionable in this book. To my mind, it bears upon it no marks of an apostolic or prophetic character It is not the habit of the apostles to speak in metaphors; on the contrary, when they utter a prophecy, they do so in clear and precise terms. Everyone may form his own judgment of this book; as for myself, I feel an aversion to it, and to me this is sufficient reason for rejecting it."

[1] Dr. *Otto*, The Conference of Cochlæus with Luther at Worms, 1521 (Austr. Quart. of Theol., 1866, nro. 1).—*Hennes*, Luther's Sojourn at Worms, Mentz, 1868.

[2] Conf. below, § 319, the letter of Count *Hoyer of Mansfeld*, written 1522.

[3] See Luther's Letters, in *De Wette*, Vol. II., pp. 3, 7, 89.

withdrawn from the diet, an imperial decree drawn up by Aleandro, and dated May 8th, placing Luther under *the ban of the empire*, was signed by the emperor, and officially promulgated. It would appear that Luther courted this sentence, for previously to his promulgation he boastfully declared that, "*If Huss had been a heretic, he himself was surely ten times as great a one.*"

The decree commanded all persons, under severe penalties, to refuse hospitality to Luther; to seize his person, and deliver him up to the officers of the empire, and to commit his writings to the flames.[1] On the Imperial Chamber of Nürnberg was laid the duty of seeing to it that the various provisions of the sentence were carried into effect. It was now very generally believed that there was an end of the heresy; that the last act of the tragedy had been performed: but a few far-seeing men thought otherwise, and predicted that the storm, far from having spent itself, was still gathering strength. "There is, as some think, an end of the tragedy," wrote the Spanish courtier, *Alphonso Valdez*,[2] to his friend, Peter Martyr; "but as for myself, I am fully convinced that the play is only opening, for the Germans are highly incensed against the Holy See."

In a strong rescript sent to the States of the Empire, bearing the date of April 19, 1521, the emperor had expressed his determination to oppose a powerful resistance to the religious tendencies in Germany; but this was in the existing circumstances impossible, for the civil discords of Spain and the desperate war he was then waging against France called forth his best energies and claimed his undivided attention.

Hence, beyond the limits of the emperor's own states and those of his brother, Ferdinand, and of the Elector of Brandenburg, the Duke of Bavaria, Duke George of Saxony, and a few ecclesiastical princes, the edict of Worms was but feebly executed, if at all. It was coldly received by the representatives of the States of Germany, who had been industriously taught to believe that this theological quarrel was no more than *a struggle against Rome*, in the destruction of whose claims they fancied they saw the realisation of wild dreams and delusive hopes.

A number of propositions extracted from the works of Luther were condemned by the Faculty of the *Sorbonne*, at Paris,[3] and by others of lesser note, and refuted by *Henry VIII.*[4] of England; but

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, 1st ed., Vol. I., pp. 213-217; 2nd ed., Vol. I., pp. 290-294.

[2] Habes hujus tragœdiæ, ut quidam volunt, finem, ut egomet mihi persuadeo, non finem sed initium; nam video Germanorum animos graviter in sedem Romanam concitari. (ep. ad Petr. Martyr). For other letters of *A. Valdez*, see Lessing supra. When the Papal Legate, Chieregati, remarked that if Hungary should be lost, Germany would also pass under the yoke of the Turk, the malcontents replied: "We had much rather be under the Turk than under you, who are the last and greatest of God's enemies, and are the very slave of abomination."

[3] Condemnatio doctr. Luther. per facultatem Paris, in *le Plat*, Monumenta ad hist. Conc. Trid. spect., T. II., p. 98 sq.

[4] Against Luther's Discourse: On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church: Adsertio septem sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum, Londini, 1521.

owing to the preoccupation of men's minds with the momentous events just related, these acts produced little, if any, influence upon public opinion. To his royal opponents and the universities, Luther replied in language of coarse vulgarity and abusive invective.[1] The admirable criticism of the heresiarch's teaching by *Fisher*, Bishop of Rochester, for the same reason, received but scant attention.[2]

Luther's Sojourn at Wartburg ("*Patmos*").

While Luther remained at the fortress of Wartburg, where, as it was paradoxically expressed, "he was a willing prisoner against his will," he was withdrawn from the baneful influence of Ulrich von Hutten, and might, with some effort, have been brought to think seriously upon his conduct, and view with some misgiving the terrible nature of the enterprise in which he was engaged. His bodily ailments and the stings of conscience not unfrequently drove him to the very brink of despair. Speaking of his feelings at this time, he says: "My heart beat with fear, and I asked myself the questions: Is wisdom thy exclusive gift? Are all others in error, and have they been so these many years? What if thou thyself art in error, leading others astray, to be damned eternally? By whom art thou commissioned to preach the Gospel, by whom called?" Luther failed to recognize these misgivings as divine warnings; he regarded them as *assaults and temptations of the devil, who*, he said, *well understood the art of frightening one by the remembrance of one's past sins.* He frequently had visions, in which demons flitted like spectres across his heated imagination. The recital of them is frequently ludicrous and trifling, but they themselves play an important part in his life. By habitually yielding to their influence, he finally brought himself to indulge the pleasing delusion that the Catholic Church was the detestable kingdom of Antichrist, and the heritage of God's anger; that he himself was John the Evangelist banished by Domitian to the island of Patmos, a second Paul or Isaias; and Melanchthon another Jeremias. His trials, though numerous and severe, were wholly unproductive of good. While at Wartburg, he often indulged in the pleasures of the chase; but the bulk of his time was given to making *a translation of the Bible into German*, so worded as to fit his own system of belief.[3] He maintained an active correspondence with his friends, and continued to still exert, through his letters and other writings, the baneful influence which his presence had inspired. It was at this time that he wrote his inflammatory and mischievous pamphlets "*Against the Idol of Halle*" (the Archbishop of Mentz); "*On Monastic Vows;* and "*On the Abuse of Masses,*" the first of which he dedicated to his father, and the last to the Augustinians of Wittenberg.[4]

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, 1st ed., Vol. I., pp. 109-110; 2nd ed., pp. 179-181.
[2] Assertionis Lutheranæ confutatio, 1523. Conf. Dr. *Læmmer*, L. c., pp. 14-20.
[3] *Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. III., p. 139 sq.
[4] *Riffel*, Vol. I., 2nd ed., p. 329 sq.

§ 304. *Death of Leo X.—His Character.*

Læmmer, Monument. Vaticana, pp. 3-10; for bibliography, see V. II., p. 922, n. 3. *Audin*, in his Life of Luther, ch. XVI., where he describes the court of Leo X. *Ranke*, Ecclesiastical and Political Hist. of the Popes in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, 4th ed., Brl., 1854, Vol. I., p. 80 sq. Engl. transl., Philad., 1841, 1844; New York, 1845; London, 1852. (Tr.)

In putting an estimate upon the character of Leo X., determining the degree of authority he exercised, and the influence of his pontificate, it should be borne in mind that he abolished the Pragmatic Sanction in France;[1] brought the Lateran Council to a close (1517); and, through his representatives, Cajetan and Miltitz, set on foot negotiations in regard to Luther. Neither should his attitude towards the emperor, Charles V., and his ambitious rival, Francis I., be overlooked. In his relations to these princes, he was bold, alert, and politic; now throwing the weight of his influence on the side of the one, and now of the other, as each in turn was superior in council or victorious in battle; always more intent on securing the possession of a province than in promoting the well-being of the Church. To artists and scholars he was magnanimous, noble, and generous; patronising them, not from feelings of vanity, but from taste and conviction, and as one having a practical and thorough knowledge of what he was doing, and why he did it. The age of Augustus seemed to have again dawned upon Rome. More devoted to art than to the duties of his offices—more enamoured of the charms of elegant literature than of the chaste beauty of Christian virtue—Leo pursued towards Luther a policy at once halting and ineffective. Regarding religion himself as a matter of only secondary importance, he could but ill comprehend how others should bear trials for its sake, and expose themselves to countless dangers in pushing forward its interests. His pontificate, though one of the most brilliant, was by no means the most happy, in the history of the Church. His lavish extravagance occasioned in great part the disastrous controversies of the age, and was a source of no little embarrassment to his successors in the Papacy. He died, December 1, 1521.

§ 305. *The Diet of Nürnberg convoked for September* 1, *and opened November*, 1522.

Raynald., Ann. ad an., 1522. *Menzel*, L. c., Pt. I., p. 105 sq. *Walch*, Works of Luther, Vol. XV., p. 2504 sq. Correspondence of Pope Hadrian VI. with Erasmus (translated from the Latin), Frankfurt, 1849. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 378 sq.

The primary object this Diet had in view in assembling was to provide measures to repel a threatened invasion by the Turks. But as Luther had returned to Wittenberg (1522), *Hadrian VI.*,[2] formerly preceptor to Charles V. and now Pope, thinking the present occasion

[1] See p. 77.

[2] *Hœfler*, Election and Accession of Pope Hadrian VI. to the Throne, Vienna, 1873; *Bauer*, Hadrian VI., being a picture of Life of the Age of the Reformation, Heidelberg, 1876.

a favourable one for putting an end to the existing religious controversies, resolved to turn it to the best account. The character of Hadrian was quite the reverse of that of his predecessor, Leo X. Sincerely and deeply religious, a true priest, of simple tastes and grave manners, he had in a certain sense a horror of the art treasures of ancient Rome, regarding them as in a measure tending to revive the idols of Paganism. His dislike of them, which was emphatic and outspoken, gave great offence to the Romans, who, besides taking an enthusiastic pride in the reign of Leo X., had financial reasons for encouraging the love of pagan art which that reign had called forth. The oft-repeated words of Hadrian, that "he would have priests for the adornment of churches, not churches for the adornment of priests," expressed a line of action with which the Romans had little or no sympathy. The growing discontent reached its height when the Pope, through his legate, *Chieregati*, Bishop of Teramo, publicly proclaimed at the Diet of Nürnberg, that, "impelled alike by inclination and duty, he would put forth his best energies to bring about all needful reforms, beginning with the papal household, the primary source of the evils afflicting the Church, to the end, that, as corruption had infected high and low, all might mend their lives and make sure their salvation." But while thus frankly avowing the faults of the papacy, and promising the correction of these and other abuses, the Pope soon learned that it was not in his power to hasten the march of events, or to shorten the time necessary to such a work. Fully persuaded that only the ignorant could be led astray by the crude and irrational teachings of Luther,[1] and that the revolt against the old faith was to be mainly ascribed to the burdens and hardships endured by the bulk of the people, he entertained the hope that this frank avowal of the existence of evil and the promise of its correction, coming from the common father of Christendom, would have the effect of allaying popular discontent, of conciliating and inspiring confidence in the minds of all. In this frame of mind, he pressed the Diet to take prompt and vigourous measures against Luther; "for," said he, with prophetic foresight, "the revolt now directed against the spiritual authority, will shortly deal a blow at the temporal also." The words of the Pontiff were ill-received by the Diet, and his warning unheeded; his frank avowal of the shortcomings of the papacy gave occasion to exhibitions of unseemly triumph, and his promise of reform was interpreted as an acceptance of defeat. The hundred and one grievances against the

[1] In a letter written by him while yet a cardinal, he said, speaking of Luther: "Qui sane tam rudes et palpabiles hæreses mihi præ se ferre videtur, ut ne discipulus quidem theologiæ ac prima ejus limina ingressus ita labi merito potuisset. . . . . Miror valde, quod homo, tam manifeste tamque pertinaciter in fide errans et suas hæreses somniaque diffundens, impune errare et alios in perniciosissimos errores trahere impune sinitur." (*Burmanni*, Analecta hist. de Hadr. VI., Traj., 1727, 4to, p. 447.) This judgment was based on the works of Luther published in Latin. His numerous works in *German* were still more calculated to lead minds astray and incite rebellion. (Vide supra, p. 30.) . . . Syntagma doctrinæ theologicæ Adriani VI., ed. *Reusens*, Lovanii, 1862; *ejusdem*, Anecdota de vita et scriptis Adriani, Lov., 1862.

Holy See were again taken up; and the convocation of an œcumenical council, to convene in some city of Germany, imperiously demanded; which should, in the first instance, provide for the general well-being of the Church, and, this accomplished, settle the Lutheran controversy. Thus far, said the assembled States, it has been found impossible to enforce the edict placing Luther under the ban of the empire, from fear of a popular insurrection. However, they falteringly added, every effort will be put forth to prevent the propagation, either orally or in writing, of the new doctrines, until such time as the council shall have convened; and to sustain the authority of such bishops as shall punish married ecclesiastics with *canonical* penalties.

The Nuncio, clearly perceiving that the temper of the States was hostile to Rome, and mortified at the ill success of his mission, withdrew from the Diet; and Hadrian, equally cognizant of their sinister designs, gave expression to his sorrow in words of reproachful tenderness, in which, while laying bare the deep and intense grief that crushed his paternal heart,[1] he seemed to take upon himself the responsibility of all the faults committed by his predecessors. Hadrian, however, did more than utter words of complaint. Desirous of putting an end to the system of wasteful extravagance that had grown up under his predecessors, he dismissed a large number of useless functionaries, thereby exciting against himself a spirit of intense hostility. To add to the bitterness of his grief, he learned that his efforts to defend the island of Rhodes (December 25, 1522) against the assaults of the Turks, had proved unsuccessful. The disastrous issue of all his most cherished projects was too much for the tender heart of the holy Pontiff, and he gradually sunk under the weight of accumulated sorrows. "How sad," said he, in his last moments, "is the condition of a Pope who would do good but cannot." On the very day of his death (September 14, 1523), the Romans gave expression to unseemly joy, in a coarse inscription placed above the door of his attending physician.[2] He was entombed in *Santa Maria dell Anima*, the national church of the Germans. At the right of the choir stands a noble sepulchral monument erected to his memory. It was executed by Michael Angelo of Siena and Nicolas Tribolo of Florence, after the designs of Badassare Peruzzi.

§ 306. *Efforts of Melanchthon and Luther to spread the New Teachings.*

In 1521, after the close of the Diet of Worms, Melanchthon published his *Hypotyposes theologicæ, seu Loci communes rerum theologicarum*, setting forth, with studious brevity and with great beauty of

[1] Letters to the Elector of Saxony; to the cities of Breslau and Bamberg Conf. *Raynald.* Ad an., 1523, nros. 73-86.

[2] Liberatori Patriæ, S. P. Q. R.—The epitaph composed by his friends, and inscribed on his tomb, does him justice. "Here lies Hadrian VI., who held that to rule is the greatest of misfortunes." So also another, composed by a Hollander, and inscribed on his cenotaph: "Alas! how greatly are the efforts of the very best men coloured by the character of their age." "Proh dolor, quantum refert in quæ tempora vel optimi cujusque virtus incidat."

language, a full account of Luther's teachings.[1] He vehemently assailed the doctrine of human free-will, stating that "in spiritual affairs the intellect and reason of man are wholly in the dark" (*quod hominis intellectus ratioque in rebus spiritualibus prorsus est cæca*). "The adultery of David," said he, "and the betrayal of Judas are as much the work of God *as the calling of Paul.*"[2] Besides advocating predestination in the most extreme and rigid sense, he claims for man an individual and immediate inspiration. As Luther had formerly declaimed in the universities against the philosophy and methods of Aristotle, so Melanchthon now expressed a wish to see the works of Plato swept from the face of the earth. To carry out literally the words of Scripture, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," he bound himself as an apprentice to a master baker. Moreover, Melanchthon frequently expressed his hearty contempt of the very ablest ecclesiastical writers, of whom it would be small praise to say that they were pre-eminently his superiors in intellectual endowments and depth of thought.

Melanchthon opens his doctrinal exposition abruptly with predestination, and then goes on to discuss the other dogmas in dispute in a series of propositions, each independent of the other, and having no essential connection as integral parts of a consistent system. He even goes so far as to state that a Christian need know no more than the existence "of law, of grace, and of sin and its power for evil" (*vim peccati, legem, gratiam*). The doctrines of *free-will, grace, and predestination*, while playing so important a part in *the scheme of faith* and justification are treated with special fulness. In subsequent editions of his work, he gave an exposition of the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, professing to ground his statements on the utterances of the first six œcumenical councils.[3] Dr. Eck promptly published, as a reply to this work, his "*Enchiridion locorum communium.*"

As Melanchthon's doctrinal exposition had been addressed exclusively to the learned, Luther undertook to perform a similar work for the more illiterate, by translating, mostly from the original text, the New Testament into the vulgar tongue. This translation, before being published, was revised by himself and Melanchthon conjointly. Translations of the various books of the Old Testament, in which he

[1] Prima ed., Vit., 1521, 4to, and oftener; ed. *Augusti*, Lps., 1821.

[2] He says, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: "Hæc sit certa sententia, a Deo fieri omnia, tam bona quam mala. Nos dicimus, non solum permittere Deum creaturis, ut operentur, sed ipsum omnia proprie agere, ut sicut fatentur, *proprium Dei opus fuisse Pauli vocationem*, ita fateantur, opera Dei propria esse, sive quæ media vocantur, ut comedere, sive quæ mala sunt, *ut Davidis adulterium;* constat enim Deum omnia facere, non permissive sed potenter, i. e., ut sit *ejus proprium opus Judæ proditio, sicut Pauli vocatio.*" (*Chemnit.*, Loci. theol., ed. *Leyser*, 1615, Pt. I., p. 173.) In the later editions of Melanchthon's Commentary, this passage was omitted.

[3] Luther, writing of this work, says: "It is a charming and noble book, and deserves to live for ever." And again: "Nothing better has been written since the days of the Apostles." Non solum immortalitate, sed etiam canone ecclesiastico dignum. On the other hand, *Strobel*, in his Literary History of Philip Melanchthon's Loci theologici (Altenburg and Nürnberg, 1776-1782), shows that this *dogmatical* work underwent subsequent variations, both as to *matter* and form.

also availed himself of the critical judgment of his friends, subsequently appeared.[1] Luther now had the effrontery to make the silly boast that he was the first to drag the Bible forth from beneath the dusty benches of the schools, an assumption which even Zwinglius some time later indignantly denied. "You are unjust," said he, "in putting forth this boastful claim; you forget that we have gained a knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures through the translations of others. To mention a few, there is *Erasmus* in our own day; *Valla*, a few years earlier; and the pious *Reuchlin* and *Pelican*, in the absence of whose labours, neither you nor others could have accomplished the great work. But I will be merciful, my dear Luther, although I should not; for the impudent boasting that pervades your books, your letters, and your discourses, merits the severest chastisement. You are very well aware, with all your blustering, that, previously to your time, there existed *a host* of scholars, who, in biblical knowledge and philological attainments, were incomparably your superiors."

Luther, in replying to those who objected that the indiscriminate reading of the Bible was dangerous, said: "Should anyone attack you, saying: the Bible is obscure, or it should be read with the aid of the commentaries of the Fathers, you will reply: this is not true, for there never existed on earth a book more easily intelligible than the Bible."

§ 307. *The Diet of Nürnberg.*

Læmmer, Monum. Vatic., p. 11 sq.—*Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trin., lib. II., c. 10. *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1524. *Ranke*, Roman Popes, Vol. I., pp. 99-129.

Clement VII. (November 19, 1523-1534), the successor to Pope Hadrian, was a humanist, and the friend of Erasmus. Prudent, considerate, and fair-minded, he exercised great circumspection in whatever he did, always weighing scrupulously every measure, in its various relations and adjuncts, before proceeding to act. This habit of caution drew upon him the imputation of acting, not as one who sees his way clearly before him, and then goes resolutely forward, but as one having an ulterior purpose in view, and making his approaches to it by a circuitous route.[2]

He was not long in making up his mind that the religious troubles in Germany demanded a prompt and vigorous treatment, and to this end he sent his legate, *Campeggio*, to the Diet of Nürnberg. When the papal legate had entered Germany, he became fully convinced, from the signs he saw about him on every side, that the people were hostile and evilly disposed towards the Pope. Arriving at the Diet, he was not a little surprised to find that Frederic, Elector of Saxony,

[1] Last ed. with Luther's corrections, 1546. *Luther's* Sendbr. v. Dollmetshen der H. S. (*Walch*, Vol. XXI., p. 316 sq.) *Mathesius*, Thirteen Sermons.—*Panzer*, Hist of Transl. of the Bible, Nürnberg (1783) 1791. *Marheinecke*, Services rendered to the cause of Religion by Translations of the Bible, 13 vl., 1815. *H. Schott*, Hist. of Transl. of the Bible, Lps., 1835. *G. W. Hopf*, Criticism of Luther's German Version of the Bible, Nürnberg, 1847. See *Audin*, Life of Luther, ch. XXIV. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. the character of Clement VII., as drawn by *Contarini* in *Ranke's* Suppl. to the Roman Popes, Vol III., pp. 25, 26.

the chief protector of Lutheranism, to whom he carried an affectionate letter from the Pope, and whom he had hoped to win back to the Catholic faith by his persuasive eloquence, was no longer there. The statement of the legate that the Pope regarded the "*Centum Gravamina*" as a fabrication of the enemies of the Holy See, rather than an honest expression of the true sentiments of the German people, produced a violent outburst of indignation from *the States present in the Diet*. The most the legate could obtain was a promise that, in the interval between the adjournment of the present and the assembling of the next Diet at Spire,[1] on the coming feast of St. Martin, the States *would do what they could* towards enforcing the edict of Worms; would submit the Grievances against the Court of Rome to the judgment of certain wise and experienced men, and have them again examined and discussed at Spire; and that all magistrates would exert themselves to prevent the publication and distribution of writings injurious to the Holy See. The action of the States was equivocal and insulting, and called forth the indignant protest of Clement VII. They make a jest of the imperial authority, said he, and, in refusing to enforce the Edict of Worms, compromise the rights of the emperor far more than the dignity of the Apostolic See.[2] The emperor, viewing their action in the same light, commanded them to strictly enforce the Edict of Worms against Luther, the second Mohammed, under penalty of incurring the guilt of high treason, and being placed under the ban of the empire. Although the action of the Diet was, for many reasons, offensive to both the Pope and the emperor, it was hardly less so to Luther. His vanity was wounded, and he bitterly complained that, after having undertaken an enterprise of unusual difficulty and danger, he now received only the reward of ingratitude for his pains. The opponents of Luther, now fully aroused and startled by the frightful consequences to which his teaching and revolt[3] would lead in practical life, prepared to take more decisive measures against him. The papal legate endeavoured to adjust the differences between Austria and Bavaria, each suspicious of the ambitious designs of the other, and finally succeeded in effecting an alliance at Ratisbon (June 5, 1524) between the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria and the Dukes William and Louis of Bavaria, to which twelve bishops of Southern Germany were also partners. The immediate object of this alliance was to protect the interests and institutions of the Catholic Church, and to enforce the edicts of Worms and Nürnberg. It was resolved that priests who should marry, should be canonically punished; that young Germans should be forbidden to make their studies at Wittenberg; and that a vigorous opposition should be made to whatever tended to propagate heresy. The opponents of Luther agreed upon a similar line of action at *Dessau*, in Northern Germany. On the other hand, the Landgrave,

[1] The Recess of April 18, 1524, in *Lünig's* Archives of the Empire, P. gen. cont. I., p. 445. *Walch*, Vol. XV., p. 2674.

[2] Cf. *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1524, nro. 15 sq.

[3] See following paragraph.

Philip of Hesse, drew to his party the new Elector of Saxony, *John the Constant* (May 5, 1525), whom he induced to sign a treaty of alliance, concluded at *Torgau*, May 4, 1526, by which the Protestant princes bound themselves to defend the principles and uphold the interests of Lutheranism in their respective States—*Mecklenburg*, *Anhalt*, *Mansfeld*, *Prussia;* and the cities of *Brunswick* and *Magdeburg*, shortly after, joined this alliance. In this way was the line of separation drawn between *Catholic* and *Protestant* Germany.[1]

If there was ever a time when it was to the interest of the Pope to closely ally himself to the emperor, it was *now;* for Charles V., and he alone, was able and willing to maintain the Catholic Church in Germany. But unfortunately Clement failed to appreciate his opportunity, and imprudently published *a brief hostile to the interests of Charles*,[2] and entered into an alliance with Francis I. The consequences of his action were disastrous. The emperor's forces besieged Rome on two different occasions, stormed and plundered the city, made the Pope prisoner, and offered many indignities to his person (May 6, 1527).

§ 308. *The New Teachings and their Practical Consequences—Disorders at Wittenberg caused by Carlstadt—The Anabaptists and the Peasants' War.*

The teachings of Luther soon found their way from his writings into the practical affairs of life. From his height at Wartburg, he flung down among the people his pamphlets on "*Monastic Vows*" and "*The Abuse of Masses.*"[3] *Bartholomew Bernhardi*, a priest of the town of Kemberg, startled the world by openly taking a wife.[4] The Augustinian friars of Wittenberg, Luther's brothers in religion, declared their Vows and the Rules of their Order null and void. Luther had told them, in his pamphlet "*On Monastic Vows*," that such restrictions were contrary to the command of God; that monasticism itself was a revolt against Christ; and that, hence, monasteries should be burned with fire, pitch, and brimstone, and utterly swept from the face of the earth, like Sodom and Gomorrah of old. At Wittenberg, Carlstadt, at the head of a fanatical mob, went about demolishing altars, overturning statues, and destroying pictures and sacred images; and, to put the crown on his sacrilegious conduct, administered the Lord's Supper to all who chose to approach, whether in the state of grace or not; and introduced the use of the German language in religious services.

[1] The limits of the territory included by the Protestant and Catholic alliances may be seen in *Wedell's* Historical and Geographical Atlas, on Map XVIII., b.

[2] See in *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1526, n. 6; also, a defence of the emperor, in *Goldasti*, Polit. Imp., Pt. XXII., p. 990 sq.; also, a partial defence in *Raynald.*, L. c., n. 22.

[3] *Walch*, Vol. XIX., pp. 1304 sq. and 1808 sq.—Cf. *Riffel*, 1st ed., Vol. I., pp. 263-267; 2nd ed., pp. 345-350. Luther said, in praise of the former of these two treatises, that, compared with the works he had hitherto written, it was (liber) "munitissimus et quod ausim gloriari invictus."

[4] *J. G. Wolter*, Prima gloria Clerogamiæ restitutæ Luthero vindicata, Neostad. ad O. 1767, 4to.

Similar scenes were enacted at *Zwickau*, where *infant baptism* was rejected, on the ground that it had no more sanction in Holy Writ than other doctrines discarded by Luther on the same plea; for it is written, "Whosoever shall *believe* and be baptized, shall be saved." Hence, they said, as valid baptism could not be conferred until persons had attained the use of reason, it was plain adults should be *rebaptized*.

Nicholas Storch, a native of Zwickau, after gathering about him a number of immediate followers, consisting of twelve apostles and seventy disciples, proceeded with the former to Wittenberg, where he preached to the people, and proclaimed himself a prophet of God.

Melanchthon himself did not see his way clear out of the difficulties proposed by these "*visionary prophets*" against infant baptism, and for a time seemed to think that their doctrine, inasmuch as it had a Scripture sanction, might be conscientiously accepted. But some time after, disgusted with the excesses of the *Anabaptists*, he also rejected their teachings. His defection was, in part at least, compensated by the accession to their ranks of *Carlstadt*, *Martin Cellarius*, a friend of Melanchthon's, the monk *Didymus*, and others. Didymus, in his sermons, warned parents against allowing their children to pursue profane studies; and Carlstadt, carrying his zeal against all human science still further, cast into the flames the text-books brought to him by students from all quarters, giving as his reason for so doing that henceforth the Bible alone should be read among men. Under pretext of following the precept of our Lord in Matthew, xi. 25: "I give thanks to Thee, O Father, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, *and hast revealed them to little ones*," he went through the streets of Wittenberg, Bible in hand, stopping the passers-by, and, entering the workshops, interrupted the artisans, to ask the meaning of difficult passages, as from persons whose minds had not yet been warped by the sophistry of science. The students passed beyond the control of the authorities, and it was feared the university would be closed. Even the heresiarchs were startled at the excesses to which their teachings had led, and began to grow uneasy, lest they might serve as a pretext to *Duke George of Saxony* for putting a stop to any further attempts at reforming the Church. Luther took alarm at the violence of Carlstadt's conduct, and wrote from Wartburg: "You have entered this conflict inconsiderately, and without method; you have thrown everything into confusion; your proceedings are without warrant or reason. I may as well let you know what I think of the business. I am disgusted. If affairs have a disastrous issue, I shall not answer for it. You have not sought my counsel before entering upon the undertaking (?!), and you will now see to it that you get on *without me*. What has been done, has been ill done, though Carlstadt may affirm over and over that you are right in acting as you do."

In vain did Luther, at the instance of Melanchthon, write to them to prove the spirits before receiving their prophecies; the disorders

went on. His friends wrote to him from Wittenberg, saying: "Come, or we perish." Frederic the Wise advised him not to leave Wartburg Castle. Luther left his Patmos, March 8, and arrived at Wittenberg on Good Friday, 1522. Shortly before leaving Wartburg, Luther wrote to the Elector:[1] "Be it known to your Highness that I go to Wittenberg under the protection of a providence stronger than that of princes and electors. I have no need of *your* support, but you have of mine; it will be of advantage to you," &c. Scarcely had he arrived at Wittenberg, when, ascending the pulpit, he began "to rap these visionaries on the snout." For eight days together, or during the whole of Easter week, he declaimed, in a series of masterly discourses, against those fanatical leaders and barbarous iconoclasts. "*All violent and untimely measures*," said he, "*employed to hasten the moment for a clearer understanding of religion, are equally opposed to the Gospel and to Christian charity. External changes in ecclesiastical affairs should be introduced only after men's minds have been convinced of the necessity of such changes.*"

Luther was now in a position to see the practical workings of his own teaching and the faithful reproduction of his own conduct, and for the moment he seemed startled by the vision. But rapidly recovering himself, he again dashed headlong into just such violent and revolutionary conduct as he had attempted to suppress, again declaiming like a maniac against religious vows.[2] "It is all one," said he, with shameless effrontery, "whether one says to God: I promise never to leave off offending Thee, or whether one says: I promise to live always chaste and poor that I may lead a just and holy life. The day has come," he continued, "not only to abolish forever those unnatural vows, but to punish, with all the rigour of the law, such as make them; to destroy convents, abbeys, priories, and monasteries, and in this way prevent them ever again being uttered."

Luther's words found a responsive echo in the hearts of the depraved. Troops of monks deserted their convents, took wives, and became ardent Lutherans. It was soon plain to Luther that these reprobate monks, acting from carnal and lustful impulses, "singularly corrupted the good odour of the Gospel." The spirit of revolt once evoked brooks no control. Luther himself rode the crest of the wave. Like Carlstadt, his former master, he gathered all his strength for an effort to abolish the Mass. To him *the ever-renewing Sacrifice* was a horror. "*Your only purpose in retaining the Mass*," said he, reproachfully, to the Collegiate Chapter of Wittenberg, which had resisted his appeals, "*is to have always at hand a convenient pretext for starting new sects and opening fresh schisms.*" The impious rage of his adherents outran his own. "These priests, these mumblers of Masses," they cried out in their impotent fury, "deserve death quite as richly as the profane blasphemers who curse God and his saints on the public

[1] *De Wette*, Luther's Letters, Vol. II., p. 137 sq.

[2] Short Epilogue against Vows and Religious Life in Monasteries, in *Walch*, Vol. XIX. p. 797

thoroughfares." By the use of violent means like these did Luther finally succeed in abolishing the Canon of the Mass (November, 1525); he retained only the Elevation.

The influence of Luther's works, and particularly of those written in the vernacular, was not confined to priests and monks alone; it extended to the bulk of the people as well. Borne down by the weight of political oppression, they listened with feelings of enthusiastic and fanatical approbation to the ideas of Gospel freedom so glowingly set forth by the new preachers. "I behold them coming from these sermons," said *Erasmus*, "with threatening looks, and eyes darting fire, as men carried beyond themselves by the fiery discourses to which they have just listened. These followers of the Gospel are ever ready for a conflict of some kind; whether with polemical or martial weapons, it matters little."

Luther called upon the people to cast off the yoke laid upon them by the priests and monks. Following his advice, the peasants refused to pay the customary taxes to bishops and monasteries. They interpreted Gospel freedom to mean a sanction authorising them to disregard whatever was disagreeable or irksome, and to rebel against princes, particularly such as remained faithful to the Church. These they were taught to look upon as tyrants and enemies to Gospel truth.

While Luther's work on "*Christian Liberty*," which had been scattered throughout the whole of Germany, prepared the way for revolt, his treatise on "*The Secular Magistracy*" (1523) formally advocated the abolition of all authority whatever, whether ecclesiastical or political.[1] The peasantry, *inflamed by the fanatical teachings and fiery appeals of the sectaries, rather than driven to excess by the tyranny and extortions of feudal lords*, rose in open and organized rebellion. In a manifesto, consisting of twelve articles,[2] based upon texts drawn from the writings of Luther, the peasants claimed, first of all, the right of appointing and removing at will their ministers of the Gospel. The insurrection rapidly spread over *Suabia*, the *Black Forest*, the *Palatinate*, *Franconia*, *Thuringia*, and *Saxony*. The peasants, assembling in large bodies, would proceed to plunder and burn convents, demolish the strongholds of the nobility, and commit every sort of outrage and atrocity.

Thomas Münzer, the leader of the sect of "*Conquering Anabaptists*" in Thuringia, preached a doctrine of political equality and freedom far more comprehensible to the illiterate peasantry than the religious equality and freedom advocated by Luther.

[1] The following extract from this treatise will indicate its drift: "Should some one say: Since (according to Luther) there is to be no sword among Christians, how are they to be made responsible for their external acts? Surely there must be some representative of sovereign authority among them. Answer such one that *no sovereign authority should exist among Christians;* each should be subject to the other, according to the words of Paul, Rom. xii.: 'In honour preventing one another;' and again: 1 Peter ii.: 'Be ye subject to every human creature;' 'honour all men.'"

[2] Cf. *Alfred Stern*, Concerning the Twelve Articles of the Suabian Peasants.

After being driven out of Altstadt, where he had incited the citizens to rebel against the civil magistrates by his revolutionary harangues, and had put himself at the head of mobs that went about demolishing Catholic chapels and overturning Catholic altars, he received an appointment as pastor in the town of Mühlhausen. Here again he headed a formidable insurrection against the civil authorities; styled himself a prophet, and signed himself "Münzer, the bearer of the sword of Gideon;" proclaimed the natural equality of all men, a community of goods, the abolition of every sort of authority, and the establishment of a new "*Kingdom of God*," composed solely of the just.

Everywhere illiterate peasants might be seen taking upon themselves the office of preaching, for they had been told that anyone might announce the word of God. They besought Luther, now that he had, by the weapon of Holy Scripture, set at defiance evey human power and authority, to undertake the defence of their cause. Luther was at first extremely embarrassed by this appeal, but finally sent them an answer in the form of an *exhortation*, addressed alike to princes and peasants,whom he styled respectively "My dear Sirs and Brothers." With his accustomed dishonesty and dexterity, he shifted the responsibility of the peasants' insurrection, from where it properly belonged, to the bishops and Catholic princes.[1] "*who*," he said, "*never wearied of crying out against the Gospel.*" As might have been foreseen, his exhortation was without effect. The peasants grew daily more bold and insolent, and their devastations and enormities more atrocious. At Weinsberg, they forced seventy knights to commit suicide, by throwing themselves against spears held before them. When Luther's enemies sarcastically taunted him with being an accomplished hand at kindling a conflagration, but an indifferent one at putting out the flames, he published a pamphlet against "*those pillaging and murdering peasants.*" "Strike," said he to the princes, "strike, slay, front and rear; nothing is more devilish than sedition; it is a mad dog that bites you if you do not destroy it. There must be no sleep, no patience, no mercy; they are the children of the devil." Such was his speech in assailing those poor, deluded peasants, who had done no more than practically carry out his own principles. They were to be subdued by the strong hand of authority, and to receive no

[1] *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 5 sq.; Vol. XXI., p. 149: concerning various districts of the country of *Baden*, see *Mone*, Sources of the History of Baden, Carlsruhe, 1848 sq., Vol. II., 4to. *Sartorius*, Essay of a Hist. of the "Peasants' War," Berlin, 1795. *Wachsmuth*, "The Peasants' War," Lps., 1834. *Zimmermann*, A General Hist. of the Great Peasants' War, Stuttg., 1843, 3 vols. *Bensen*, Hist. of the Peasants' War in East Franconia, written from the sources, Erlangen, 1840. *Cornelius*, Studies on the Hist. of the Peasant War," Munich, 1862; *Schreiber*, The Peasants' War in Germany, Freiburg, 1864. *Jörg*, Germany during the Revolutionary Period from 1522-1526, Freiburg, 1851. Cf. also the following Essays: Causes of the Peasants' War in Germany (Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. VI., p. 321 sq.); The Breaking out of the Peasants' War, its character, and the actors therein (L. c., pp. 449-469): Defensive operations against the Peasants (ibid., pp. 627-644); Manifestoes and Scheme of Constitution of the Peasants (ibid., pp. 641-664); Bearing of Luther during the Peasants' War (L. c., Vol. VII., pp. 170-192); see also *Riffel*, Vol. I., pp. 412-479; 2nd ed., Vol. I., pp. 508-581.

sympathy, no mercy, from their victorious conquerors. It is computed that a hundred thousand men fell in battle during the Peasants' War, and of this immense loss of life Luther took the responsibility. "I, Martin Luther," said he, "have shed the blood of the rebellious peasants; for I commanded them to be killed. Their blood is indeed upon my head; but," he blasphemously added, "*I put it upon the Lord God, by whose command I spoke.*"[1]

Melanchthon's connection with the Peasants' War is still more strange. Although more discreet and temperate than Luther, it is nevertheless undeniable that the benignant mildness popularly ascribed to him had in it a large admixture of violent passion and vindictive rancour, and he was therefore not long in following in the footsteps of his master. Replying to Prince Louis, Count Palatine of the Rhine, who, being desirous to prevent the further effusion of the blood of his people and to restore order, had asked his opinion as a theologian on the peasants' manifesto of the Twelve Articles (1525), he said that "it was his *settled conviction* that the Germans had been granted a great deal more freedom than was beneficial to people so rude and uncultured."[2] He also taught that the just rights of the peasantry might be legally violated. "As governments can do no wrong," said he, "they may confiscate the communal lands and forests, and no one has a right to complain; they may confiscate the wealth of churches, and apply it to secular uses, and no resistance should be made. The Germans should submit to the grievance as did the Jews of old when the Romans plundered their temple." "Thus," says *Bensen*,[3] "while the Catholic Church has never sanctioned, at least in theory, the oppression practised by prelates and nobles, and has ever defended—sometimes successfully, but always obstinately—the rights of individuals and nations against even emperors themselves; the evangelical reformers are justly reproached with having been the first to teach and to preach the doctrine of servile submission and the right of the stronger to the Germans." By the advice of Luther and Melanchthon, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse; Henry, Duke of Brunswick; and George, Duke of Saxony, took the field against the peasants, and very nearly annihilated their numerous army at the battle of Mühlhausen, fought May 15, 1525.

Münzer was taken prisoner, and, after submitting to a wearisome investigation and enduring painful torture, was beheaded. In the presence of death, and when about to meet his God, he abjured his errors, and professed that he wished to die an obedient and repentant son of the Church he had so often and so violently outraged. He besought the *princes* to deal clemently and mercifully with the pea-

[1] Luther's Table-Talk, Eisleben ed., p. 276. Cf. †**Friedrich*, Astrology and the Reformation; or, the Astrologers as the Preachers of the Reformation and Authors of the Peasants' War, Munich, 1864.

[2] *Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. I., p. 371 sq.

[3] L. c., § 19.

sants, and exhorted *these* to render a proper obedience to constituted authorities.[1]

Luther was now the object of universal execration; for while the principles set forth in his works openly favoured revolt, and tended to stir up sedition, he had counselled princes[2] to destroy with fire and sword poor peasants who were only carrying out in practice what he advocated in theory. Of the thirty articles, in which the peasants set forth their grievances, some were copied literally from his German writings, and demanded exemption from all taxes, the abolition of the seigneurial courts, the discontinuance of the payment of tithes and other dues, and the right of every parish to appoint and remove their ministers at will; while the twenty-eighth avowed open hostility to all his adversaries. Even Erasmus rebuked Luther for the course he had pursued. "We are now gathering," said he, "the fruits of your teaching. You say indeed that the Word of God should, of its nature, bear very different fruit. Well, in my opinion, that greatly depends on the manner in which it is preached. You disclaim any connection with the insurgents, while *they regard you* as their parent, and the author and expounder of their principles. It is notorious that persons who have God's word constantly in their mouth, have stirred up the most frightful insurrections." Neither should it be forgotten that, even as early as the year 1522, Luther wrote exultingly to his friend Link, at Wittenberg: "The people are everywhere rising; *their eyes are at length opened;* they will no longer suffer themselves to be cruelly oppressed." In 1526, Luther's tone had changed; he was no longer what he first proclaimed himself, the champion of the people; from this time forth he was the apologist of power, and *the friend and counsellor of princes.*

§ 309. *Henry VIII., King of England, and Erasmus oppose Luther—Marriage of Luther.*

Cf. **Kerker*, Erasmus and his Theological Point of View (Tübingen Theological Quart. Review, 1859, n. 7).

Henry VIII., King of England, formally ranged himself among the enemies of Luther. He was irritated and alarmed by the reformer's revolutionary schemes, as set forth in "*The Captivity of the Church in Babylon.*" Among other startling assertions, it was there stated that the Papacy, far from being of divine origin, was an anomaly in church government, and an insufferable usurpation; that it

[1] *Seidemann*, Thomas Münzer, being a biography written from the sources found in the State Archives of the Kingdom of Saxony, Dresden and Lps., 1842. Cf. Hist. and Polit. Papers, art. "*Thomas Münzer*," Vol. VII., pp. 238-256; 310-320. *Riffel*, Vol. I., pp. 479-522; 2nd ed., pp. 581-632. *Schmidt*, Justus Menius, the Reformer of Thuringia, Lps., 1867.

[2] *Thomas Münzer* had already violently assailed Luther, in replying to the harsh language employed by the latter against the peasants. He styled him "an ambitious and deceitful scribbler, a proud fool, a shameless monk, a doctor of lies, an accomplished buffoon, the Pope of Wittenberg, the impious and carnal man of Wittenberg," &c.

had distorted many of the truths of primitive revelation, and had been instrumental in reducing the Church to the condition of captivity, in which the Daughter of Sion now mourned. Henry, first of all, addressed a letter to the emperor and to Louis the Elector Palatine, dated May, 1521, requesting them to silence Luther, and eradicate his teaching.[1] The crowned theologian, who, had his brother Arthur lived, might have filled one of the archiepiscopal sees of England, entered a little later on the *field of polemics* against the Saxon monk. Closeted with his chancellor, the Archbishop of York; with Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and other prelates,[2] he wrote the "*Defence of the Seven Sacraments against Dr. Martin Luther*," in which he triumphantly refuted every false statement and defective argument of his adversary. Following the line of reasoning pursued in a former age by Tertullian, he demonstrated that papal authority and the power of the keys had been, at all times and everywhere, recognized by Christians; defended the Mass as the great central act of Christian worship, and established its character as a sacrifice; and, going through the list of the reformer's errors, gave complete and irrefragable answers to them all. Towards the close of the Defence, Henry sums up Luther's character. "This petty doctor," says he, "this grotesque saint, this pretender to learning,[3] in the pride of his self-constituted authority, spurns the most venerable doctors the world has known, the most exalted saints, and the most distinguished biblical scholars." "What profit," he presently continues, "can come of a contest with Luther, who is of nobody's opinion, who does not understand himself, who denies what he has once affirmed, and affirms what he has already denied? He is a shameless scribbler, who sets himself above all laws, despises our venerable teachers, and, in the fulness of his pride, ridicules the learning of the age; who insults the majesty of pontiffs, outrages traditions, dogmas, manners, canons, faith, and the Church herself, which he professes, exists nowhere outside of two or three innovators, of whom he has constituted himself the leader."[4] But Henry was not content to use invincible reasoning alone; he had recourse to wit, sarcasm, and such popular arguments as would place the contradictions of his adversary in the fullest light. His brilliant polemics won for him from Pope Clement the title of "*Defender of the Faith*" (*Defensor Fidei*), a distinction which placed him on a plane with the great Catholic sovereigns of Europe, and which he had long desired to possess. It should be remarked that the "*Defence*" of the royal theologian, although possessing considerable merit, was vastly overrated by the king's admirers, who politely assured him that it was quite equal to anything St. Augustine had written.

[1] *Walch*, Luther's Works, Vol. XIX., p. 153 sq.

[2] *Audin*, Life of Luther, London, 1854, Vol. II., p. 50. (Tr.)

[3] Doctorculus, sanctulus, eruditulus.

[4] Adsertio VII., Sacram. adv. Luther., Lond., 1521, pp. 97, 98. *Walch*, Vol. XIX., p. 158. See above, p. 210, note 2. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., pp. 342-371; 2nd ed., p. 433 sq., where is likewise described Luther's attitude over against Duke George of Saxony.

Luther was prompt with his reply. He styled himself "Luther, by the grace of God, *Ecclesiastes* of Wittenberg." The production is a model of vulgarity and indecency.[1] Henry did not pursue further this method of warfare; he had recourse to diplomacy, where he hoped to be more successful.

In the sequel of his controversy with the royal champion, whose political influence proved more efficient than his theological learning, Luther showed himself to be the most vile of hypocrites. Perceiving that a rupture was imminent between Henry VIII. and the Holy See, and desirous to secure the good offices of that prince in a conflict against a common enemy, he addressed him a letter couched in words of fulsome adulation, and conveying an apology for former insults. But Henry was not so easily mollified; a remembrance of unforgiven wrongs still dwelt in his memory, and he took advantage of this opportunity to publicly expose the duplicity of Luther, and to hold him up to the sneers and derision of the world.[2]

The distinguished scholar, *Erasmus*, had early excited the indignation of the monks by his sarcastic flings at their shortcomings, and by his unsparing freedom in criticising the existing ecclesiastical abuses. Indulging the hope that Luther's efforts might prove effectual in bringing about a reform in the Church, he had, like George Wicel, Cochlæus, Willibald Pirkheimer, and Ulric Zasius, at first expressed sympathy with the reformer,[3] and insisted on giving him a trial before condemning him. Luther, on his part, was anxious to secure the friendship of Erasmus, and took occasion to inform him that he had a high esteem of his character, and regarded him as "the glory and hope of Germany, and a man of transcendent learning and genius." But Erasmus and his friends, perceiving that Luther's policy retarded, instead of accelerating true reform, exposed the truth, which, it was said, would be purified of all error, to the wranglings of an ignorant multitude;[4] and everywhere encouraged disorder and tumult, threatening schism in the Church and anarchy in the empire, instantly took alarm, and severed their connection with the party of the reformer. The apprehensions of Erasmus were all the more keen and intense, inasmuch as he was fully capable of appreciating the splendid talents of Luther. "*Would to God*," he wrote to Duke George of Saxony, "*that there was less merit in the writings of Luther, or that they were not so utterly marred by his extreme malice.*"

There was a general wish to see Erasmus take part in the contro-

[1] Luther called Henry "a crowned ass, a liar, a varlet, an idiot, a snivelling sophist, a swine of the Thomist herd. Courage, you swine; burn me if you dare. Henry and the Pope," he said, "are equally legitimate; the Pope has stolen his tiara, and the King of England his crown, which accounts for their rubbing each other like two mules. Thou art a blasphemer, not a king; thou hast a royal jawbone, nothing more; Henry, thou art a fool," etc.

[2] *De Wette*, Vol. III., p. 23 sq. *Walch*, Vol. XIX, p. 468 sq. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 355; 2nd ed., p. 446 sq.

[3] *Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. I., pp. 1-186.

[4] The opinion of Erasmus is given in his "De amicabili Ecclesiæ concordia." Cf. *Esch* on Erasmus (Raumer's Hist. Manual for 1843).

versy, as everyone knew the weight his name and influence would carry with them. Princes and prelates, and even Pope Hadrian,[1] besought him to come forth from his peaceful retirement, to give over for a time the pleasures and attractions of literary pursuits, and take up the defence of the Church. He reluctantly yielded, but not until he could no longer decently hold back. He began by showing the untenableness of the underlying principles of Lutheranism—"not," says a Protestant writer,[2] "as a blind defender of the Roman Court, nor as one having a superstitious reverence for consecrated prejudices, nor yet as a personal enemy of Luther's, but as a peaceful opponent of his opinions, and as one who states his doubts and puts forth his views with the modesty of a scholar and the dignity of an independent thinker." In the first place, he showed that Luther, in quoting Scripture against free-will, had done so to no purpose, and then proceeded to establish the doctrine from the very same source.[3] Luther made haste to reply, and employed against his antagonist all the brutal ribaldry that characterized his answer to Henry VIII.[4] This vaunted champion of intellectual freedom comes forward and says boldly, that *human will is a slave*, doing what it does at the bidding of a master. This, he says, is its characteristic since the fall, and to leave no doubt as to his meaning, he compares it now to Lot's wife turned into a pillar of salt; now to the trunk of a tree; and, again, to a shapeless block of stone, which sees not, hears not, and has lost all sense of feeling.[5] He advocates and defends the following propositions, asserting a fatalism more in harmony with the degrading teachings of the Koran than the divine truth of the Gospel, which Mr. *Lessing* has characterized as more bestial than human, and nothing short of a frightful blasphemy.[6] Man, says Luther, is like a horse. "Does God leap into the saddle? The horse is obedient, and accommodates itself to every movement of the rider, and goes whither he wills it. Does God throw down the reins? Then Satan leaps upon the back of the animal, which bends, goes, and submits to the spurs and caprices of its new rider. The will cannot choose its rider, and cannot kick against the spur that pricks it. It must get on, and its

[1] Epist. Erasmi, Ep. 639. Sentiments of Erasmus of Rotterdam, Cologne, 1688, pp. 26, 27. *Audin*, Life of Luther, London, 1854, Vol. II., c. IV. (Tr.)

[2] *Planck*, History of Protestant Dogmatics, Vol. II., p. 112.—Cf. especially the points of comparison as drawn by *Zasius*, a contemporary of the reformers, and to be found in *Döllinger*, Hist. of the Ref., Vol. I., pp. 177-179.—*Riffel*, Vol. II., pp. 251-298.

[3] De libero arbitrio diatribe, 1524, written with much care, yet *wanting in the dogmatic precision* so conspicuously absent from all the author's works (*Walch*, Vol. XVIII., pp. 19, 62).

[4] Luther calls *Erasmus* a Pyrrhonian, an *unbeliever*, and a disciple of *Lucian*, a blasphemer and an atheist, having within him a sow of the Epicurean herd.

[5] De servo arbitrio ad Erasm., 1525 (*Walch*, Vol. XVIII., pp. 20, 50). Luther's work on Slave-Will went through ten editions. *Audin*, Life of Luther, London, 1854, Vol. II., ch. VII.

[6] *Lessing* puts these words into the mouth of a Lutheran: "Speak not to me of free-will; I am an honest Lutheran, and will persist in holding that *man is destitute of free-will*, though the error be bestial rather than human, and have the character of a blasphemy." (On the Doctrine of Spinoza).

very docility is a disobedience or a sin. The only struggle possible is between the two riders, God and the devil, who dispute the momentary possession of the steed. And then is fulfilled the saying of the Psalmist: 'I am become like a beast of burden.'" "Let the Christian then know," he continues, "that God foresees nothing contingently; but that He foresees, proposes, and acts from his eternal and immutable will. This is the thunderbolt that shatters and destroys free-will. Hence it comes to pass, that whatever happens, happens according to the irreversible decrees of God. Therefore, necessity, not free-will, is the controlling principle of our conduct. God is the Author of what is evil in us, as well as of what is good; and as He bestows happiness on those who merit it not, so also does He damn others who do not deserve their fate."[1]

The groundwork of Luther's whole system, as Plank very justly observes, is the assumed slavery of the human will, and we find him writing to Capito, in 1537: "Let all my writings perish, if only my work 'On Slave-Will' and my catechisms be preserved." Even the "*Formula Concordiæ*," or book of Lutheran symbols of faith, gives Luther the same distinction. "Luther," it says, "has given a solid and beautiful explanation of this subject (human will) in his work 'On Slave-Will.'" "*Hoc negotium in libro de servo arbitrio . . egregie et solide explicuit.*"

This champion of *free-inquiry* was obliged to go whither the logical deductions of his system would lead him, and he did not halt at difficulties. There were Scripture texts plainly against his theory of the inherent slavery of the human will; but even these he set aside by an *ipse-dixit*, distorting them from their natural sense and obvious meaning, by blasphemously asserting that God, when inspiring the passages in question, was playfully mendacious, secretly meaning just the reverse of what He openly revealed; and that the Apostles, when speaking of human will and *actions*, gave way to an impulse of unseemly levity, and used words in an *ironical sense*.[2]

The quiet of Erasmus' life was again broken in upon. Luther's bold assertion and defiant sense of error again called forth the powers of his intellect and the resources of his learning. He wrote a *second work* against the heresiarch, entitled the "*Hyperaspistes*,"[3] in which, with more severity of tone and incisive brilliancy of style than he had formerly employed, he mercilessly exposed the wilful ignorance of Luther and his criminal waywardness. The latter, deeming it

[1] Lutheri opera Latina, Jenæ, T. III., fols. 170, 171, 177, 207. Witt. Germ. fols., 534 b, 535 a. (Tr.)

[2] "To do," said Luther, "*means to believe—to keep* the law *by faith*. The passage in Matthew, 'Do this and thou shalt live,' signifies: *Believe this* and thou shalt live. The words '*Do this*' have an ironical sense, as if our Lord would say: Thou wilt do it to-morrow, but not to-day; only make an attempt to keep the commandments, and the trial will teach thee the ignominy of thy failure." *Walch*, Luther's Works, Vol. VIII. p. 2147.

[3] *Hyperaspistes*, Diatr. adv. servum arb. Luth., Pt. II., p. 526 sq. (Opp. ed. Cleric., T. X., p. 1249). Cf. on this controversy, *Riffel*, Vol. II., pp. 250-298.

imprudent to provoke further discussion, addressed a letter to Erasmus, artfully flattering the scholar, and feigning sorrow for having gone beyond the limits of polemical courtesy. The flattering letter has been lost, and the character of its contents is known only from the reply of Erasmus.[1] Erasmus had not been more brutally treated than others. Luther's language to the Bishop of Meissen, as well as to *Emser* and Doctor *Eck*, and to the theological faculties of *Louvain* and *Paris*,[2] had been equally violent and abusive; and as we shall see further on, when we come to speak of his disputation with Carlstadt on the Lord's Supper, he did not forget his art as time went on.

In the midst of these conflicts, and while the disastrous War of the Peasants was still going on, Luther, now grown corpulent and rubicund, threw off the monastic habit (December, 1524), and a few months later (June 13, 1525) married Catharine Bora, to the great astonishment of his friends, whom he had not apprised of his intention. Catharine had been a nun in the Cistercian convent of Nimptschen, near Grimma, in Saxony, afterwards broken up; but tiring of a religious life, into which she had been reluctantly forced by her parents, she invoked the good offices of Luther, who sent *Bernard Köppe*, a citizen of Torgau, to her relief. This young man one night forced the doors of the convent, secured Catharine, who, by precon certed arrangement, was expecting him, and hurried her away to Wittenberg.[3] She is described as disagreeable, imperious, and haughty, "but as much beloved by Luther as the Epistle to the Galatians, and more acceptable to him than the possession of the Kingdom of France or the Republic of Venice." This step was thought hasty and inconsiderate by his friends; and even Melanchthon, in a letter to Camerarius, confesses that the announcement of the event surprised and disquieted him not a little. Luther's enemies had a hearty laugh "It was thought," said Erasmus, "that Luther was the hero of a tragedy; but, for my own part, I regard him as playing the chief character in a comedy, which has ended, as every comedy ends, in a marriage." Luther himself said he took the step "to *encourage* the Cardinal Elector of Mentz, cousin to the apostate Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, who could hardly hesitate to follow *so illustrious an example.*"

§ 310. *Organization of the Lutheran Church in Hesse and Saxony.*

Riffel, Vol. II., pp. 1-126, where this subject is exhaustively treated.

As time went on, it became quite clear, from the character and scope of the questions discussed by the sectaries, that a deadly blow

[1] Epp. (ed. Cleric.) XXI., 28: "Optarem tibi (Luth.) meliorem mentem, nisi tua tibi tam valde placeret. Mihi optabis quod voles, modo ne tuam mentem, nisi Dominus istam mutaverit."

[2] Conf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., pp. 108-111.

[3] *Engelhard*, Lucifer Wittebergensis; or, the Morning Star, i.e., Complete Life of Catharine von Bora, Landshut, 1749, 2 vols. *Walch*, Catharine von Bore, Halle, 1751, 2 vols. *Beste*, Catharine von Bora, Halle, 1843. *Meurer*, Catharine Luther, Dresden, 1854.

was being aimed, not only at the dogmatic teaching and internal constitution of the Church, but at her external organisation as well. Luther had already made some progress in this direction, and while he had succeeded in abolishing episcopal jurisdiction in countries where the principles of the Reformation had taken root, he had as yet failed to put any other form of ecclesiastical government in its place. The question then naturally arose as to the character and limits of the jurisdiction to be exercised by ecclesiastical superiors. Luther wished *Canon Law*[1] swept from the face of the earth, and, in his intemperate zeal and fanatical haste to do away with it for ever, had pitched a copy of it into the flames, together with the papal bull of excommunication. By this act he drew upon himself the violent hostility of the "*Jurists*," who taunted him with introducing novel and exceptionably *lax principles on marriage*,[2] which they held to be the *sacred bond* alike of the family and the State, but which he denied to be in any sense a sacrament, and regarded as simply an affair of expediency and business, falling within the same category as eating and drinking, buying and selling. To provide a remedy for these difficulties, *Philip*, the young *Landgrave of Hesse*, Luther's most zealous partisan since the death of the elector, Frederic the Wise of Saxony, convoked a synod to convene at *Homburg*, in October, 1526. The leading spirit in this synod was the apostate Minorite monk, *Lambert of Avignon* († 1530), who, in a very eloquent speech, recommended the adoption of a synodal constitution, based upon democratic principles, and granting to each congregation full control of its own ecclesiastical discipline. As the Landgrave plainly saw that this plan would secure him pecuniary advantages and great political influence, he did not hesitate to adopt it; and as it had among its advocates, besides the eloquent Minorite, *Adam Krafft*, the court chaplain, he at once gave orders to have it carried into effect.[3]

Cf. the exceedingly beautiful and touching remark on this event, by *Surius*, Ad. an., 1525. Cf. Defence of *Simon Lemnius*, by *Lessing*, in his seventh and eighth letters (Complete Works of Literature and Theology, Carlsruhe edit., Pt. IV., pp. 29-37).

[1] His saying was: *Purus canonista est magnus asinista.*

[2] See his famous "*Sermon on Marriage*" (1526), in the Jena ed., Pt. II., fol. 151, where the following passages are found. (The requirements of our language will not admit of a translation.) (Tr.) "Quid," he asks, "si mulieri ad rem aptæ contingat maritus impotens?" And he replies: "Ecce, mi marite, debitam mihi benevolentiam præstare non potes, meque et inutile corpus decepisti. Fave, quæso, ut cum fratre tuo aut proxime tibi sanguine juncto occultum matrimonium paciscar, sic ut nomen habeas, ne res tuæ in alienos perveniant.

"Perrexi porro maritum debere in ea re assentire uxori, eique debitam benevolentiam spemque sobolis eo pacto reddere. Quod si remuat, ipsa clandestina fuga saluti suæ consulat et in aliam profecta terram, alii etiam nubat."

And again (fols. 156, 168): "If the wife refuse, call in the serving-maid. . . . If she, too, refuse the marriage-duty, send her away, and in the room of Vashti put Esther, after the example of King Ahasuerus."

Luther was still more indulgent to princes. See *Walch*, Luther's Works, Pt. XXII., p. 1726. Cf. *Luther's* Marriage-code, particularly where he treats of the *objects* of matrimony and the *impediments to divorce* (Histor. Polit. Papers, Vol. XI., pp. 410-435).—*Döllinger*, the Reformation, Vol. II., pp. 427 sq. and 623 sq.

[3] Cf. *Riffel*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 76-126, On the Introduction of the New Doctrines into Hesse. *Hassenkamp*, Ch. H. of Hesse from the Reform., Marburg, 1853.

John the Constant, the new Elector of Saxony, while fully in sympathy with the Lutheran movement, was less prompt in action than Philip of Hesse. In consequence, the pastors throughout his dominions took the initiative, and requested him to introduce for the government of the various churches a system similar to that already adopted in Hesse. He at length consented to introduce the system of *Parochial Visitation* suggested by Luther. Melanchthon embodied the main features of this plan in a *Formulary, or Book of Visitation*,[1] containing a short Confession of the Evangelical faith. In this way, the several churches, though each was independent of all the others, preserved a sort of outward uniformity. The elector appointed a commission, consisting of laymen and ecclesiastics, by whom preachers were set over the various parishes, and the ancient ecclesiastical foundations abolished. In 1527 and 1528, a visitation of the various churches was made by a commission of four, composed of *theologians* and *jurists*. Officers called *Superintendents*, exercised a general supervision over all ecclesiastical affairs, and decided matrimonial cases; but the *reigning prince* was *ex officio* the *supreme* authority in whatever related to church government.

In the course of the visitation of 1527 and 1528, Luther discovered that both clergy and people had but scant religious information, and fully alive to the paramount importance of instructing the young as a means of giving stability and permanence to his work, without which all others would be futile, he published, in 1529, two *catechisms*, *a larger* and *a smaller*, written in clear, plain language, intelligible alike to old and young.[2]

Such was the origin of the *collegiate* and *territorial* ecclesiastical organisation of Saxony, which replaced the ancient hierarchical and papal government, and became the model for the Lutheran churches of every other country. These changes were greatly accelerated by the irresolute and vacillating policy pursued by the Diets of which we are about to speak, and henceforth princes favourably disposed to Lutheranism might have no fear of following their inclinations, or giving the most practical expressions to their sympathies.

§ 311. *Diets of Spire* (1526, 1529).

According to the agreement entered into by the Catholic and Protestant princes[3] at the Diet of Nürnberg, the States assembled at Spire in 1526.[4] The emperor was engaged in a harassing and protracted war, and the Archduke Ferdinand was wholly occupied in re-

[1] Instruction for the Parochial Visitors (Lat., 1527), with Luther's preface, Wittenberg, 1528, 4to. German and Latin edit., by *Strobel*, Altdorf, 1777. Edited, with a hist introd. and explanatory notes, by *Weber*, *Schlüchtern*, 1844. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. II., pp. 52-61.

[2] *Walch*, Vol. X., p. 2 sq. Cf. *Augusti*, Hist. and Critical Introduct. to the two great Catechisms, Elberfeld, 1824.

[3] See § 307.

[4] *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 350 sq.

pelling the advance of the Turks, who were seriously threatening Hungary. The Lutheran princes were in consequence bold and defiant, and seemed to have been more or less influenced by the impious assertion of Luther, that "*to fight against the Turks is to resist God, whose instruments they are in chastising our iniquities.*" When they appeared at the Diet, they showed the complete and thorough discipline of an organized religious party, were exacting in their demands, and menacing in their speech and conduct. Under the circumstances, they had matters pretty much their own way, and extorted from the Diet the following concessions:—"1. Until such time as an œcumenical council should convene, each State was at liberty to act in regard to the Edict of Worms as in its judgment seemed best, and to be responsible for such action to God and the emperor. 2. Each prince was bound to furnish aid against the Turks at the earliest possible moment."[1] The latter provision came too late. *Louis, King of Hungary*, had been defeated by Soliman, near Mohacz, August 29, 1526, and perished in the morasses. His crown was inherited by the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria.

The Lutheran princes, regardless of the engagements entered into in this Diet, began immediately to make preparations for an aggressive war, from which both Luther and Melanchthon attempted in vain to dissuade them, by telling them that "the word of God and his work were their own defence, and stood in no need of human aid; they were strong enough of themselves to repel every assault of their enemies." The Lutheran princes, however, became daily more and more settled in their determination to take up arms; but, as if their own resolution were not sufficient to drive them forward, it received a fresh and violent impulse from another quarter. *Otho von Pack*, the wicked and unscrupulous chancellor of Duke George of Saxony, sent a forged document to the Landgrave of Hesse, purporting to be a copy of an alliance entered into at Breslau by his master with Ferdinand of Austria and the German bishops for the subjugation of the Lutheran princes, and the division of their States among the conquerors. That the instrument was a fabrication, was plain enough; but there were not wanting evil-disposed persons to give currency and credit to its contents, and Luther was especially rejoiced at the opportunity it afforded him of damaging in the public estimation the character of Duke George, whom he regarded as his personal enemy.[2] In the course of a correspondence carried on some time later between the Landgrave of Hesse and his father-in-law, Duke George of Saxony, the former admitted that he had been practised upon; but the admission came too late to correct the evil—the story had gone abroad and done its work, in widening and deepening the breach between the two parties. This was evident when, in 1529, the States of the empire again convened at Spire, for the double purpose of adjusting religious

[1] *Sleidan*, Lib. VI.; *Kapp*, Gleanings, etc., Pt. II., p. 680; *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 214.
[2] Cf. the detailed account of *Riffel*, Vol. I., pp. 371-376, note 1; Vol. II., p. 356 sq.

difficulties and providing measures against the Turks,[1] who had already advanced in formidable numbers as far as Vienna, and were repulsed only by the heroism of the garrison and the gallantry of the citizens of the German capital. The Lutheran princes were accompanied to the Diet by their own chaplains, and each celebrated divine worship after his own fashion. The Catholic princes submitted as the basis of settlement very fair and moderate propositions, being substantially the same as the articles accepted by both parties three years before. These stipulated that "the Edict of Worms should be maintained in the States in which it had been already received, but that the others might retain the new doctrines until the assembling of an œcumenical council, because it would be dangerous to abolish them; that in the meantime no one should be permitted to preach against the Sacrament of the Altar; that the Mass should not be abolished where it was still celebrated, and, where it had been already abolished, no one should be molested for hearing or celebrating it in private; and, finally, that the ministers of the Church should preach the Gospel according to the Church's received interpretation, and should carefully avoid touching controverted questions, concerning which the decision of the council should be awaited."

These propositions were certainly just and conciliatory, but the Lutheran princes thought otherwise, and on April 19, 1529, they solemnly protested against them, whence their name, *Protestants*, which they have ever since retained, and their only bond of unity from that day to this has been a common protest against the Catholic Church. *Claiming to be the exclusive heirs of the true religion, and the only members of the one saving Church of Christ, they maintained that the Mass, being plainly from the words of Holy Writ an idolatrous act of worship, could not, and ought not, be tolerated.*[2] They, moreover, sent a copy of their protest to the emperor, who was then at Bologna. Charles V., having conquered France and Italy, concluded peace with Pope Clement VII., June 20, 1529, at *Barcelona*, and shortly after at *Cambrai*, with Francis I. On the 24th of the following February, he received the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope, at Bologna. As has been stated, the Lutheran princes, some time previous to this event, sent their protest to Charles, who stated, in reply, that "the Catholics were quite as little disposed as the Protestants to act against their consciences and their faith, and longed quite as ardently as they for the convening of an œcumenical council, which, they had every reason to hope, would be a source of glory to God, of peace to Christian princes, and of every manner of good to Christendom; but,"

[1] See the Acts in *Walch*, Vol. XVI., pp. 328-429.

[2] It was to show how "un-Catholic is such unity against the Catholic Church, and to expose the spirit of disunion among Protestants themselves," that *Weislinger* wrote his "*Friss Vogel oder stirb*," i. e. "*Neck or Nothing*," Strasburg, 1726. It is not likely these gentlemen were so oppressed with scruples of conscience as they would have us believe, for they protested against the decision of the Diet of Spire, in 1526, prohibiting the dissemination of the teaching of the Sacramentarians, whom Luther now pronounced the greatest of scourges, and persecuted accordingly.

he said, in conclusion, "until such time as the council should convene, he wished the Protestant states to strictly enforce the decisions of the Diet." The deputies, having formally protested against the emperor's action, were by his order cast into prison, whence they were shortly after released. On the 21st of January, 1530, the emperor convoked another Diet, to convene at Augsburg, at which he promised to be present in person, and give a hearing to both parties, and expressed the hope that all would lay aside controversial rancour and bitterness, and unite their efforts for the common weal of Christendom.

Owing to the unusual outburst of violence which accompanied *the renewal of the controversy on the Lord's Supper*, the condition of the Protestants grew daily more critical. The wide divergence of opinion on this question between Luther and Zwinglius was prominently brought out in the *Seventeen Articles*, so called, of *Schwabach* and *Torgau*, embodying the teaching of the former.[1] *Philip*, Landgrave of Hesse, dreading fresh disturbances among his own people, *arranged for a conference at Marburg* (October 1, 1529) between the two champions, which, to his great disappointment, instead of bringing them nearer to each other, drove them farther asunder. "You do not at least refuse to regard us as brethren," said Zwinglius at the close of the disputation, "for we desire to die in the communion of Wittenberg?" "No, no," replied Luther; "cursed be such an alliance; begone, you are possessed of another spirit than ours."[2] "The Zwinglians," he added, "are a set of diabolical fanatics; they have a legion of devils in their hearts, and are wholly in their power."[3] After these outbursts, Luther said, in a spirit of considerate forbearance, that he still retained for them feelings of Christian charity, which, he explained, he entertained towards all men!

Melanchthon now felt that he had committed a blunder in opposing, at the Diet of Spire, the measures directed against the Sacramentarians, and bitterly regretted his folly. The conviction was strong upon him that he had, by his conduct on that occasion, contributed not a little towards the dissemination of the errors of Zwinglius.

§ 312. *Diet of Augsburg*, 1530—*Religious Peace of Nürnberg*, 1532.

Walch, Vol. XVI., p. 374 sq. *Förstemann*, Documents supplementary towards the Hist. of the Diet of Augsburg, Halle, 1834 sq., 2 vols. *Cœlestini*, Hist. comitiorum Augustæ celebratorum, Francofurti ad Viadrum, (1577) 1597. *Chytræus*, Hist. of the Confession of Augsburg, Rostock, 1576. *Salig*, Hist. of the Augsburg Confession, Halle, 1733 sq., 3 Pts.; the same, ed. by *Pfaff*, Stuttg., 1830; by *Fickenscher*, Nürnberg, 1830. *Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. III., cap. 3. Cf. *Hase*, Libri symbolici Evangelicorum, Lps., 1837. *Menzel*, loco cit., Vol. I., p. 335 sq. *Riffel*, Vol. II., pp. 378-441, on the Diet of Augsburg, and pp. 442-519, on the Protestant League and the religious peace of Nürnberg.

The emperor did not arrive at Augsburg until the 15th of June. The following day, being the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament, was the

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 375 sq. [2] *Erasmi*, Ep. ad Cochlæum. (Tr.)
Schmitt, The Religious Conference at Marburg, Marburg, 1840.

occasion of fresh difficulties, as the Protestant princes peremptorily refused to join the procession, which always takes place on that day, or in any way to participate in the religious ceremonies. The emperor requested the Protestant princes to lay before him a written confession of their faith and an enumeration of the abuses which they refused to accept. The preparation of the document was committed to Melanchthon, who, following the Seventeen Articles of Schwabach or Torgau as his guide and basis, composed what has since been known as the Augsburg Confession, or Symbol of Faith (*Confessio Augustana*).[1] Luther gave it his fullest approval. "I am quite pleased," he says, "with the document; I see nothing in it that requires either changing or mending. I could not myself have written it, having neither the sweetness of temper nor self-restraint necessary to the task." It consisted of an introduction, or preamble, and *two* parts—the first being an exposition of what its authors *believed*, in *twenty-one articles*, based upon the Apostolic and Nicene Symbols; and the second, an enumeration of the so-called *abuses*, in seven articles.[2] Among the abuses were included *Communion under one kind, private Masses, the celibacy of the clergy, monastic vows, the distinction of meats for days of abstinence, auricular confession, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy as a system of church government.* The first part, which contained Luther's doctrines clothed in graceful, conciliating, and insidious language,[3] was carefully and artfully written, the object

[1] While the Diet was still in session, this Confession went through many editions, and each contained fresh alterations, of which Melanchthon knew nothing, In 1530, he published a new edition of it, adding a preface, in which he says: "*Nunc emittimus probe et diligenter descriptam confessionem ex exemplari bonæ fidei;*" and in the following year he added a *defence* of it. A new edition of the Augsburg Confession of 1530 was published at Leipsig in 1845.

Shortly after the Diet, Melanchthon began to make some alterations and recast the expressions, and in 1540 published a new edition under the title of *Confessio variata*, containing important changes and additions, chiefly in reference to the Lord's Supper, with a view to harmonise the teachings of the Lutherans and Calvinists. These alterations were subsequently the occasion of no little controversy, inasmuch as they were repudiated by the orthodox Lutherans, who refused to depart from the doctrine of the *Invariata Confessio Augustana*, while the reformed party held with equal tenacity to the *Confessio variata*. It is by no means certain that the Confession generally accepted by Lutherans is identical with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, for the copies found in the various archives are at variance with each other, and the original Latin and German copies laid before the Diet have been either lost or slumber in the library of either Rome or Madrid. Cf. *Hase*, Libri symbol, varietas variatæ confessionis, in Prolegom., P. XII.-LXI.

[2] Not twelve articles, as the French translator of Alzog, and Abbé Darras, who copied from him, erroneously state. The twenty-one articles are: 1. Of God; 2. Of Original Sin; 3. Of the Son of God; 4. Of Justification; 5. Of Preaching; 6. Of New Obedience; 7 and 8. Of the Church; 9. Of Baptism; 10. Of the Lord's Supper; 11. Of Confession; 12. Of Penance; 13. Of the Use of Sacraments; 14. Of Church Government; 15. Of Church Order; 16. Of Secular Government; 17. Of Christ's Second Coming to Judgment; 18. Of Free Will; 19. Of the Cause of Sin; 20. Of Faith and Good Works; 21. Of the Worship of Saints. The second and more practical part, which is carried out at greater length, contains seven articles on disputed points: 22. On the Two Kinds of the Sacrament; 23. Of the Marriage of Priests; 24. Of the Mass; 25. Of Confession; 26. Of Distinctions of Meat; 27. Of Conventual Vows; 28. Of the Authority of Bishops. *Chambers'* Cyclop., art. "Augsburg Confession." (Tr.)

[3] As is well known, the utterances of Luther in regard to *faith*, made both at an earlier and a later period of his life (see p. 199), are insanely blasphemous. In the course of

being to give the least possible prominence to distinctively Lutheran principles, and the greatest to points held in common by Catholics and Protestants. But with all his care and skill, Melanchthon could not clothe error in the vesture of truth; the heresies of the Saxon monk could not be concealed, the chief of which were the following: 1. That *original sin* has wholly incapacitated man for doing good, 2. That *justification* depends on *faith alone;* 3. That "*free-will* is to be acknowledged in all men who have the use of reason; not, however, in affairs relating to God, which can be neither begun nor completed without Him; but only in affairs relating to the present life and the duties of civil society."[1] As regards *faith and good works*, the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church were grossly misrepresented; for, it was said, whereas, on the one hand, her members were not heretofore required to have faith; on the other, they were obliged to perform all sorts of external works of piety, such as reciting beads, making pilgrimages, and the like; 4. That the *Church*, properly defined, is the assembly of the saints, among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity, and the Sacraments (of which five were thoughtfully abolished by the saints) are rightly administered; 5. That the *confession of mortal sins to a priest* is not necessary or obligatory; and that absolution consists in declaring sins remitted, though they are not in fact so remitted; 6. That the *veneration and invocation of Saints* are unlawful practices, and must be discarded; 7. And, finally, that *transubstantiation* does not take place *in the Sacrament of the Altar*.

A difficulty now arose as to the public reading of the Confession in the Diet. The Protestant princes, who had severally signed it, contended against the Catholic princes, that, in fairness, it should be read; and, against the emperor, that, if read at all, it should be read *in German*, and not in Latin. They were successful in both instances, and the Confession was publicly read in German by *Bayer*, one of the two chancellors of the Elector of Saxony, during the afternoon session of June 25, held in the chapel of the imperial palace. *Campeggio*, the Papal Legate, was absent. The reading occupied two hours, and the powerful effect it produced was, in a large measure, due to the

a letter, written to Melanchthon from the Castle of Wartburg, in 1521, he says: "Esto peccator et pecca fortiter; sed fortius fide et gaude in Christo, qui victor est peccati, mortis et mundi: peccandum est, quamdiu hic sumus. . . . Sufficit quod agnovimus per divitias gloriæ Dei agnum, qui tollit peccata mundi, ab hoc non avellet nos peccatum, etiamsi millies uno die fornicemus aut occidamus." (Lutheri epp. a Joann. Aurifabro coll., Jen., 1556, 4to, T. I., p. 545.) The *Confess. Augustan.*, artic. IV., de *justificatione*, on the other hand, says: "Item docent, quod homines non possint justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratis justificentur propter Christum *per fidem*, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit." (*Hase*, L. c., p. 10.) According to this passage, faith appears to be the *fastigium;* whilst, according to the Catholic idea, it is the *initium, radix, fundamentum* omnis justificationis. Justification, according to Lutheran doctrine, *covers* sin; God simply *declares man just*. According to Catholic doctrine, justification *is worked out*, since its conditions are *abolitio peccati* and *renovatio seu sanctificatio interioris hominis*.

[1] *Audin.* Life of Luther. London. 1857, Vol. II., p. 334. (Tr.)

rich, sonorous voice of Bayer, and to his distinct articulation and the musical cadence of his periods. Having finished, he handed the Confession to the emperor, who submitted it for examination to *Eck*, *Conrad Wimpina*, *Cochlæus*, *John Faber*,[1] and others of the Catholic theologians present in the Diet. They not only pointed out the errors it contained, but showed, by placing passages of it beside extracts taken from the writings of Luther, that it did not fairly represent his teachings; that it concealed, under an insidious and graceful phraseology, those most offensive to Catholic ears, and gave marked prominence to those against which no exception could be taken. Of course, the Catholic theologians, in replying to the Confession, could not be wholly unmindful of the disasters which the principles of the Reformers had already brought upon Germany, or entirely divest themselves of the bitter feelings of indignation which in consequence naturally filled their minds. These feelings, in a measure, found expression in their answer, which, besides being occasionally intemperate was severely caustic and ironical, and on this account not quite acceptable to the emperor and the Catholic princes, who advised that the matter be again taken under consideration, and a fresh answer prepared. After the first fire of indignation had burned out, the Catholic theologians, returning to a better sense, saw the need of keeping their temper, and the prudence of observing in their answer a strictly judicial calm. Under the influence of these convictions, they again set themselves to the work of examining the Confession. Each article was singly taken up, discussed, and analysed, according to the rigorous rules of logic, and then a dispassionate judgment as to its merits or demerits was passed. Luther's teachings were examined in the light of Catholic tradition, and it was shown in what they harmonized with Catholic faith, and where and how far they diverged from it. Such was the character of the *Confutation of the Augsburg Confession* (*Confutatio Confessionis Augustanæ*) as finally agreed upon, and read in a public session of the Diet, held August 3rd, and with which the emperor and the Catholic princes expressed themselves fully satisfied. The Protestant princes were commanded to disclaim their errors, and return to the allegiance of the ancient faith, and "should you refuse," the emperor added, "we shall regard it a conscientious duty to proceed as our coronation oath and our office of protector of Holy Church require."[2] This declaration roused the indignant displeasure of the Protestant princes. Philip of Hesse, dissatisfied with the vacillating timidity of Melanchthon, excited general

[1] Faber was a Dominican, and at this time first Vicar-General of the Bishop of Constance, Provost of Ofen, and Court-chaplain to King Ferdinand.

[2] These two writings, in Latin and German, have been published and reviewed in "*The Catholic*," 1828 and 1829; also in Lat. and Germ., with an Introd. by Canon *Kieser* of the Chapter of Freiburg, Ratisbon, 1845. Cf. *Læmmer*, Ante-Tridentine Theology, p. 43 sq. †*Binterim*, The Diet of Augsburg, 1530, and the sentiments expressed by William, Duke of Bavaria, and Stadion, Bishop of Augsburg, concerning the Lutheran Confession, Düsseldorf, 1844. The former *is represented* as having said: "If I correctly understand the issues, the Lutherans stand firmly *upon* the Scriptures, and we by the *side* of them;"

alarm by abruptly breaking off the transactions, lately entered upon between the princes and the bishops, and suddenly quitting Augsburg. Charles V. now ordered the controverted points to be discussed in his presence, and appointed seven Protestants and an equal number of Catholics to put forward and defend the views of their respective parties. Of these seven, three were theologians, two princes, and two jurists. On the Catholic side, the theologians were *Eck*, *Wimpina*, and *Cochlæus;* the princes, *Stadion*, Prince-bishop of Augsburg, and *Henry*, Duke of Brunswick; the jurists, *Bernard Hayen*, chancellor to the Archbishop of Cologne, and *Jerome Vehus*, the chancellor of Baden; on the Protestant side, the jurists were *Dr. George Brück* and *Dr. Sebastian Haller*, the former chancellor to the Elector of Saxony, and the latter to the Margrave of Brandenburg; the princes, *John Frederic*, crown-prince of Saxony, and *George*, Margrave of Brandenburg; the theologians, *Melanchthon*,[1] *Brenz*, preacher of Hall, in Suabia, and *Schnepf*, court-chaplain to the Landgrave of Hesse. These theological commissions came to a satisfactory understanding with each other on the questions of *original sin*, *justification*, *the constituent parts of penance*, *the Lord's Supper*, and *the veneration of the Saints*. A select commission was next appointed, consisting of Eck and Melanchthon and four jurists, two for each party, who took up the discussion of Communion under both kinds. The Catholic theologians promised to obtain for Germany the same concessions that had been granted to the Hussites, provided the other points in dispute could be adjusted to the satisfaction of all. Apart from the Mass, celibacy, and episcopal jurisdiction, on which both parties were in hopless disagreement, there remained still other differences, the settlement of which, even if it had been effected, could not have been other than momentary and illusory. If the importance of unity could be overrated, it would be difficult to understand why the Catholic theologians put forth so great efforts to secure it; the more so, since its realisation seemed next to impossible, inasmuch as the principles from which each party started were as completely opposed to each other as light is to darkness. "For," as *Pallavicini* forcibly observes "Catholic faith rests upon a principle one and indivisible, viz., *the authority of the infallible Church;* to make the smallest concession here would be to surrender the whole ground: what is one and indivisible stands as a whole, or falls as a whole." But these considerations, though an inseparable obstacle to any concessions on the part of Catholics, had no similar import or force with Protestants, who daily yielded one point after another, thus conclusively demonstrating that the immutable dogmas of faith were after all but a trifling matter to them, and by no means the primary cause of their revolt.

and the latter as having solemnly declared, that "all that had been read before them (i. e., Augsburg Confession) was pure and undeniable truth;" but be this as it may, it is quite certain that *George*, the Protestant Duke of Brandenburg, having openly affirmed, after the reading of the Confession, that he would willingly have his head struck off in defence of it, the emperor replied with his usual composure: "*No head! no head!*"

[1] *Spiecker*, Melanchthon at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530 Review of Positive Theology. 1845, Pt. I., p. 98 sq.)

Melanchthon was not unwilling to have even *episcopal rights and prerogatives* retained. "How," said he, "shall we dare be so bold as to deprive bishops of their authority, if only they continue to teach sound doctrine? Will you have me speak out my mind? Well, then, I should like to give them back their episcopal power and spiritual administration. Were the Church destitute of a governing power," he candidly confesses, "we should languish under a tyranny, compared with which that of which we are just rid would be more tolerable."

In a letter bearing the date of July 6, and addressed to *Campeggio*, the Papal Legate, he is still more outspoken, expressing his wish to have the Roman Pontiff retain his office of Head of the Church, which he continued to do—not, however, from a desire to comply with Melanchthon's request. "We have no doctrine," says this reformer, in a candid mood, "other than that of the Roman Church. If she consent to dispense to us those treasures of good-will, of which she is so lavish to her other children, and to overlook certain matters of trivial importance, and avert her eyes from others—which, though we should wish it ever so sincerely, cannot now be changed or mended—we will yield her a prompt and ready obedience. We hold in honour the Pope of Rome and the whole constitution of the Church, and are prepared to cast ourselves at the feet of the Roman Pontiff once we have the assurance that he will not repel us. Why should he refuse to hear our suppliant prayer, when unity may be so easily restored? The obstacles in the way of a sincere reconciliation are only differences of opinion, so trifling that even the canons do not require complete harmony as a condition of unity with the Church."[1] These pacific words startled the friends of Melanchthon, and the cities, prominent in their advocacy of Lutheranism, and notably Nürnberg, addressed him words of stinging rebuke, of which he bitterly complained. "You can hardly imagine," he wrote to Luther, "how odious my efforts to restore jurisdiction to bishops have rendered me to the people of Nürnberg and many others."[2] "*Their disposition to find fault*," he added, "*plainly shows that they are more intent on gaining their private ends, than on securing the success of the Gospel.*"

Luther, being under ban of the empire, could not participate in the Diet of Augsburg, and in consequence took up his residence at Coburg, where he was within convenient distance to be consulted on any important matter that came up, and to encourage his disciples when their spirit failed them. Displeased at the course pursued by Melanchthon, he sharply reproved him, saying: "I will hear of no

[1] Melanchthon's ep. ad Camerarium, pp. 148 and 151. Cf. *Cœlest.* Hist. August. Confess., T. III., fol. 18, in the resumé of *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1530, nro. 83. *Pallavicini*, L. c., lib. III., c. 3.

[2] *Walch*, Works of Luther, Vol. XVI., p. 1793. Cf. with this letter of Sept. 1st that of August 28th, *ibid.*, p. 1755: "The imperial cities are violently incensed against episcopal authority. It would seem that their one aim is to be despotic in governing and licentious in morals, they take so little account of religion or its teachings.'

attempt to bring about unity of doctrine, inasmuch as such unity is impossible until the Pope consent to put away the surroundings of the papacy. You will bring disaster upon the whole business by your ceaseless quibbling and interminable concessions. These Catholics adroitly spread snares for our feet, which we must watchfully avoid."[1]

Had Melanchthon been as honest as he was sincere in his convictions, and as courageous as he was timid, he might at this time have broken once for all with Protestantism; but being under the powerful influence of Luther's superior mind, he ignobly consented to do as the latter bade him. So, instead of following up and pressing his efforts to bring about a reconciliation, he prepared and published his "*Apology for the Augsburg Confession*," which was intended to be an answer to the *Confutation* of the Catholic theologians. The Protestant princes laid a copy of the "Apology" before the emperor, who rejected both it and the Confession; but by many of the Protestants the former was held to be of equal authority with the latter. On the other hand, the four cities specially attached to the teachings of Zwinglius, viz., *Strasburg*, *Constance*, *Lindau*, and *Memmingen*—produced a confession of faith, known as the "*Confessio Tetrapolitana*," embodying their special tenets; while *Zwinglius* produced another of his own, giving special prominence to the points on which his opinions were in conflict with those of Luther on the Lord's Supper. Melanchthon was so utterly amazed at the boldness of Zwinglius in daring to exercise the common right of all reformers, that, in writing to one of his friends, he accounted for it by saying that "*he had certainly gone mad.*"

After many more equally fruitless attempts to bring about a reconciliation, the emperor, on the 22nd of September, the day previous to that fixed for the departure of the Elector of Saxony, published an edict, in which he stated, among other things, that "the Protestants have been refuted by sound and irrefragable arguments drawn from Holy Scripture." "To deny free-will," he went on to say, "and to affirm that faith without works avails for man's salvation, is to assert what is absurdly erroneous; for, as we very well know from past experience, were such doctrines to prevail, all true morality would perish from the earth. But that the Protestants may have sufficient time to consider their future course of action, we grant them from this to the 15th of April of next year for consideration."

[1] In this letter, which bears the date of August 28 (*De Wette*, Vol. IV., p. 156), he uses the strange language underscored in the following passage, which has been so frequently quoted against him: "Ego in tam crassis insidiis forte nimis securus sum, sciens, vos nihil posse ibi committere, nisi forte peccatum in personas nostras, ut perfidi et inconstantes arguamur. Sed quid postea? Causa et constantia et veritate facile corrigatur. Quamquam nolim hoc contingere, tamen sic loquor, ut si qua contingeret, non esset desperandum. *Nam si vim evaserimus, pace obtenta, dolos (mendacia) ac lapsus nostros facile emendabimus*, quoniam regnat super nos misericordia ejus." The word *mendacia* is found in *Chytræus* (born February 26, 1530), Hist. Aug. Conf., Francof., 1578, p. 295; *Cœlestini* Hist., loco cit., T. II., fol. 24. But *Veesenmeyer*, in his Review of Luther's Letters, attacks it, p. 31, and *Gieseler* rejects it altogether (Text-book of Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt 1, p. 265). (*Doller*) Luther's Catholic Monument, Frankfurt, 1817, p. 309 sq. See *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 422 sq.

On the following day, *Joachim, Elector of Brandenburg*, speaking in the emperor's name, addressed the evangelic princes and deputies of the Protestant cities[1] as follows: "His majesty is extremely amazed at your persisting in the assertion that your doctrines are based on Holy Scripture. Were your assertion true, then would it follow that his Majesty's ancestors, including so many kings and emperors, as well as the ancestors of the Elector of Saxony, were heretics! There is no warrant in the Gospels, or elsewhere in Holy Scripture, imposing the obligation of seizing another's goods, and sanctioning their retention, on the plea that they cannot, consistently with the dictates of conscience, be given up. . . The emperor also has a conscience, and, in our opinion, is far less inclined to deviate from the teachings of Christ's Holy Church and her venerable and ancient faith, than the Elector of Saxony and his allies."[2]

The Protestant princes forthwith took their leave of the emperor.

On the 13th of October, the "Recess," or decree of the Diet, was read to the Catholic States, which on the same day entered into a Catholic League.[3] On the 17th of the same month, sixteen of the more important German cities refused to aid the emperor in repelling the Turks, on the ground that peace had not yet been secured to Germany.[4] The Zwinglian and Lutheran cities were daily becoming more sympathetic and cordial in their relations to each other.[5] Charles V. informed the Holy See, October 23, of his intention of drawing the sword in defence of the faith. The "Recess" was read to the Protestant princes November 11, and rejected by them on the day following,[6] and the deputies of Hesse and Saxony took their departure immediately after. On the 19th of November, it was again read in presence of the emperor, and the princes and deputies still present in Augsburg. The decree was rather more severe than the Protestants had anticipated, inasmuch as the emperor declared that he felt it to be his conscientious duty to defend the ancient faith, and that "the Catholic princes had promised to aid him to the full extent of their power." The "Recess" was made public, November 22, and two days after the emperor set out for Cologne, having wholly failed to accomplish the object of his visit. The failure was mainly to be ascribed to the conflicting interests of the Catholic and Protestant princes; for while the former, dreading the consequences of a civil war, neglected to second the emperor's efforts in any efficient way, the latter had to be conciliated if their aid was to be secured in prosecuting a war against the Turks, whose aggressive movements were at this time filling Europe with fear and alarm. The appointment of the emperor's brother, Ferdinand, as King of the Romans (1531), gave deep

[1] The princes were the Elector of Saxony and five others in alliance with him; and the six cities were Nürnberg, Reutlingen, Kempten, Heilbronn, Windesheim, and Weissenburg. (Corp. Ref. II., pp. 474-478). (Tr.)

[2] See the powerful speech delivered in the name of the emperor by the ardent Catholic, *Joachim Elector of Brandenburg*, in *Menzel*, Vol. I., p. 406.

[3] *Documents*, II., pp. 737-740. (Tr.) [4] *Corp. Ref.* II., pp. 411, 416. (Tr.)

[5] *Documents* II., p. 728. (Tr.) [6] *Documents* II., p. 823; *Corp. Ref.* II., p. 437. (Tr.)

offence to the Protestant princes, who now expressed their determination of withholding all assistance from the emperor until the "Recess" of Augsburg should have been revoked.

Assembling at *Smalkald* on Christmas Day, 1530, they entered into an alliance offensive and defensive, known as the League of Smalkald, on March 29, 1531, to which they severally bound themselves to remain faithful for a period of six years. They were still further encouraged to go boldly forward in their new course by the advice of Luther and Melanchthon, who, reversing their former judgment, now authorised *the use of arms for the maintenance of Protestantism*. The Turkish sultan became now, in a measure, the natural ally of the Protestant princes; for, being himself desirous of profiting by the divisions in Germany, he encouraged those who were the cause of them to hold out against the emperor. Perhaps the most offensive and burdensome clause of the "Recess" of the Diet was that *requiring the Protestants to restore the Church property of which they had taken possession*, and placing those who refused compliance under the ban of the empire.

The danger from the threatened invasion of the Turks becoming daily more imminent, the emperor saw the necessity of concluding peace—on favourable terms, if possible; otherwise, on the best he could extort. For this purpose, he opened negotiations at Frankfurt, which, through the efforts of the Elector of Mentz and the Elector Palatine, were brought to a conclusion at Nürnberg, July 23, 1532. It was here agreed that, until the assembling of a general council, no action should be taken against any of the princes; that in the interval everything should remain unchanged; that both parties should cease to carry on religious hostilities; and, finally, that those only *who had already received the Confession of Augsburg* should be included in the treaty of peace. The Protestant princes, acting on the suggestion of Luther and Melanchthon, urgently demanded the insertion of the last clause; and the latter at the time expressed themselves fully content with what they had gained.

As the Turks continued to advance on Europe, the consternation caused by their progress afforded the Protestant princes an opportunity to still further strengthen themselves, by forming new alliances against the emperor, and they were not slow to make the best of their advantages. *Philip of Hesse* opened negotiations with Francis I., King of France. Ulric, Duke of Würtemberg, who had been placed under the ban of the empire, and whose states had been transferred to Ferdinand, having joined the Protestant League, was forcibly reinstated in his duchy by Philip of Hesse. *John Brenz* and *Erhard Schnepf* gave form and organization to Protestantism in Würtemberg, where it had been propagated by the apostate monk, *John Mantel*, assisted by *Conrad Sam*, of Rotenacker, and others.[1] Negotiations were also opened with the Swiss, and as the perfidious and pliant *Bucer* was

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 664-674.

ever ready to accommodate himself to circumstances, and to sacrifice his religious convictions to his sordid interests, a union was concluded between the Swiss Church and the Lutheran princes, although against Luther's own wish and advice (1538). While agreeing, or professing to be in agreement in matters of doctrine, they allowed everyone to interpret the formula of consecration in the Lord's Supper according to his private judgment: a principle which has the unusual merit of securing unity of belief, by granting a general permission to all to believe and to disbelieve what they like.

§ 313. *Ulrich Zwingli and Œcolampadius.*

Zwinglii, Opera ed. *Gualther*, Tig. (1545), 1581, 4 vols. in fol.; ed. *Schuler* et *Schulthess*, Tig., 1829-42; eight Pts., in 11 vols. (prima ed. completa). German edition by the *same* editors, Zürich, 1828 sq. Corpus libror. symbolicor., qui in eccl. *Reformatorum* auctoritatem publicam obtinuerunt, ed. *Augusti*, Elberfeld, 1827. Collectio confessionum in ecclesiis reformatis publicat., ed. A. H. *Niemeyer*, Lps., 1840. *Œcolampadii* et *Zwinglii*, Epp. lib. IV. (Bas., 1536, fol.), 1592, 4to. This work is preceded by *Osw. Myconii*, Ep. de vita et obitu Zwinglii. . . . The Lives and select Writings of the Founders of the Reformed Church, with an Introductory by *Hagenbach*, Elberfeld, 1857 sq., 10 vols. *Mœrikofer*, Ulrich Zwingli's Life according to original Documents, Leipsig, 1867. **Ægid. Tschudi* (Landamman of Glarus, † 1572), Chron. Helv. ed. Iselin., Bas., 1734, fol., 2 T. (1000-1470); a manuscript work, derived from archives and rare sources; he goes as far as 1570. (Cf. the Life and Works of Giles Tschudi, by *Ild. Fuchs*, St. Gall, 1805, 2 parts). †*Salat*, Chronicles and Full Account of the Commencements of the new heresies of Luther and Zwingli, to the end of the year 1534; manuscript in fol. . . . *Hottinger*, Ch. H. of Switzerland, Zürich, 1708 sq., 4 vols., 4to. *J. Basnage*, Hist. de la relig. des églises réformées (Rotter., 1690, 2 T., 12mo); La Haye, 1725, 2 T., 4to. *Ruchat*, Hist. de la réform. de la Suisse, Genève, 1727 sq., 6 vols., 12mo. *J. E. Huesslin*, Essay supplementary to the Hist. of the Reformation in Switzerland, Zürich, 1741-53, 5 vols. *Sal. Hesse*, Origin, Development, and Consequences of Zwingli's Reform at Zürich, Zürich, 1820, in 4to. *Wirz* and *Melchior Kirchhofer*, Hist. of the Swiss Churches, Zürich, 1808-19, 5 Pts. †**Riffel*, Hist. of the Church of Christ during modern times. Vol. III., Mentz, 1847. Chronicles of the Reformation, by *George* the Carthusian, Basle, 1849. *Examination* of the prejudices against the Catholic Church, by a Protestant Layman, 3rd ed., Lucerne, 1842, 2 vols. Cf. bibliography preceding § 298, and the art "*Zwingli*," in the Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopædia.

The condition of ecclesiastical affairs in Switzerland, at the opening of the sixteenth century, differed but slightly from that of Germany and other countries. *Literature* and science had received a fresh impulse from the activity of Erasmus, and their study was being prosecuted with unusual ardour and success. The Friends of God, emulating their brethren in the Netherlands, imparted *religious instruction* to the people, and so wide was the influence of the teaching and example of these holy men, that it might be traced north and south from their respective centres of activity, along the course of the Rhine, embracing the whole of that beautiful and fertile district. The *Plenarium*, which was a German translation of the ordinary of the Mass, including hymns, meditations, and prayers in aid of preparation for the reception of the Sacraments, arranged for the use of the people by a Carthusian monk, breathed a spirit of the warmest and purest mysticism. But if this much may be said in a *general* way of the healthful condition of religious practice and feeling, it

must be added, on the other hand, that the state of cathedral chapters, the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and the morals of the clergy, regular and secular, were far from satisfactory. We should not, however, omit to mention that the diocesan synod, held by *Christopher Uttenheim*, Bishop of Basle, in 1503, corrected many abuses and disorders, and still attests, by its wise provisions, his enlightened solicitude and pastoral zeal for his flock.

That the seeds of the Reformation, once they had taken root here, sprung more rapidly into life, had a more vigorous growth, and developed the distinctive features of Protestantism with more definiteness of form than they elsewhere attained in the same space of time, is mainly attributable to the peculiarities of the *political* and *ecclesiastical* constitution of Switzerland. Her inhabitants, enjoying *a larger measure of independence* and *a freer democratic constitution* than those of other countries, jealously defended both the one and the other whether assailed by ambitious foreign princes from without or by worldly ecclesiasticals from within. The charter of rights, secured to the Swiss nation in the instrument called the "*Priests' Franchise*," in 1370, and again renewed and confirmed by the *Treaty of Stanz*, in 1481, was ever regarded by them as the sacred bulwark of their liberties, and their watchful and stubborn defence of its provisions is amply attested in their frequent political conflicts with their bishops. But these guarantees, such as they were, did not secure so large a measure of good to the bulk of the people as they would, had their operation not been impeded by *the imperfect ecclesiastical organization* of the country. There were altogether six bishoprics in the whole of Switzerland, which, however, were not united in *one* ecclesiastical province. Constance and Choire were suffragans of the metropolitan of Mentz; Basle and Lausanne of the Archbishop of Besançon; Como of the Patriarch of Aquileja; and Sion was exempt, having been declared so by Leo X. Finally, Switzerland, enjoying a more liberal constitution than her neighbours, became the resort and asylum of such false mystics as the Lollhards, Beghards, and Beguines, after they had been expelled their own country.

The author of the first religious controversy in Switzerland was *Ulrich Zwingli*, the son of a yeoman, who held the office of landamman, or chief magistrate, in the town of Wildhausen, situated in the Alpine valley of Toggenburg, in the canton of St. Gall. He was born January 1, 1484, and, as he grew up, received an excellent education, studying humanities at Bern, philosophy at the University of Vienna, and theology at Basle, under *Thomas Wyttenbach*. He was a fine classical scholar, and possessed a wide acquaintance with theological writers, and a critical knowledge of theological science. A man of brilliant talents, keen and penetrating intellect and great oratorical powers, he was incapable of profound and well-sustained thought, and wholly destitute of the speculative faculty. Appointed parish priest of *Glarus*, in the diocese of Constance, in 1506, he attracted the notice of the Papal Legate, through whose kind offices he received an annuity

of fifty florins, to enable him to prosecute his literary labours on the Latin classics and the Fathers. In the years 1512, '13, and '15, he served as chaplain to such of the inhabitants of Glarus as took part in the campaigns in Lombardy, fighting in defence of the Holy See against the French, and in consideration for these services received from the Pope a pension, which was continued until the year 1517. After the year 1513, he gave himself seriously to the study of Greek and the New Testament, and in 1516 was appointed preacher in the convent of *Maria Einsiedeln*, where he began to declaim violently against pilgrimages and devotion to the Blessed Virgin. But so little was he suspected of any heretical leaning that, in 1518, Antonio Pulci, the Papal Legate, created him by diploma chaplain to the Holy See. He was shortly obliged to resign his care of souls in consequence of his *amours* with a woman of notorious and profligate character becoming public. He was now called to Zürich, where, receiving the appointment of preacher in the "Cathedral," or Great Minster, he again began to declaim with increased violence against the shortcomings and disorders of the clergy, of which he professed to have had abundant evidence from personal observation, made during his many and protracted sojourns in Italy. He himself afterwards made it a matter of boast that he had preached the Gospel of Christ as early as 1516, before even the name of Luther had been heard in Switzerland; and that during the two following years, when the Saxon reformer was still unknown in that land, *he had relied upon the Bible, and the Bible alone*. In his opening address at Zürich, January 1, 1519, he called for a reformation of the Church and a return to purity of morals, and seemed to think an immoral profligate like himself the proper person to effect the one and exemplify the other. That he was lamentably ignorant of the historical development of the Church and the Papacy, his discourses furnish the most abundant proof.[1]

The Zwinglian movement was in some respects strikingly *similar*, and in others strikingly *dissimilar*, to that of Luther. The two reformers were born *within a year* of each other; both had visited *Rome* previously to their defection, but they carried away with them very different impressions. Both began *by assailing the preachers of indulgences*, and while Luther defended his teachings in a *disputation* against Eck of Ingolstadt, at Leipsig, in 1519, Zwingli and Œcolampadius defended theirs in a similar disputation at Baden, in 1526. Both possessed the gift of popular eloquence in an eminent degree, and employed it to misrepresent and vilify the Catholic Church and her doctrines; and, finally, both were assisted by men of superior culture and *scientific* training—Luther by Melanchthon, and Zwingli by Œcolampadius.

They were *dissimilar* in this—that while the basis of Luther's system was a *false mysticism*, that of Zwingli's was wholly and thoroughly *rationalistic;* Luther opposed liberal studies and polite

[1] Cf. The Situation of Basle, etc., vide infra, p. 248, n. 1.

learning on principle; Zwingli was an apologist of Paganism and an excessive advocate of its literature; Luther was in a continuous state of morbid unrest, and the victim of harassing and unnecessary scruples; Zwingli was, from the opening of his career, light-minded and frivolous, and a slave to sensual pleasures; Luther, during the early days of his revolt, professed to trust the success of his cause to the power of the Word of God, though he invoked the power of the magistracy some time later; Zwingli, from the very beginning, relied on the civil authority for the propagation of his teachings and the triumph of his principles. Moreover, being at bottom a radical republican, Zwingli directed his earliest efforts to an attempt to overturn the Papacy and the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, boasting that he had, three years previously to his defection, taken counsel with Capito *as to the best means of deposing the Pope*. An implacable enemy of all preachers of indulgences, he assailed *Bernard Samson*, a Franciscan, with all the energy of his eloquence and the vehement passion of his nature. Not content with having them excluded from the pulpits of Constance and driven beyond the limits of the city by an order from the bishop, he attacked the doctrine itself, and was delighted to observe that his hearers not unfrequently listened to his furious philippics with undisguised pleasure. In 1520, he obtained from the Grand Council of Zürich a decree, commanding that the Word of God should be taught wherever their jurisdiction extended, only as found in Holy Scripture, regardless of any ecclesiastical tradition or authoritative interpretation. *Leo X.* summoned Zwingli to Rome to give an account of his teaching; and, still later, *Hadrian VI.*, conformably with his character, wrote him a tender and paternal letter, which entirely failed of its purpose, for the reformer suddenly broke with the Church, and openly proclaimed himself an heresiarch. In 1522, he demanded from Hugo of Landenberg, Bishop of Constance, in his own name, a general *permission for priests to take wives*. "Your Lordship," he candidly said, "very well knows how disgraceful have been my relations heretofore with females (for I would speak only of myself); how these have been the scandal and ruin of many. Since, therefore, I know from personal experience that I cannot lead a pure and chaste life, inasmuch as God has denied me this gift, I demand the privilege of taking a wife. I feel within me the carnal lust, of which St. Paul speaks,[1] and have often come to grief in consequence," &c.

When the bishop, instead of acceding to the demand, rigidly enforced the rule of celibacy, and punished any infraction of it with severe penalties, Zwingli severed his last thread of connection with the Church, rejected the authority of œcumenical councils, and in a circular letter, addressed to the Swiss people, declared *celibacy an invention of the devil.*"

In connexion with the government of the canton, he arranged for a religious conference to be held at Zürich, in January, 1523, at which

[1] 1 Cor., vii. 9.

sixty-seven theses were proposed for discussion, and challenged the Bishop of Constance and others to meet him, of whom *John Faber*, Vicar-General of Constance, alone accepted. The propositions discussed were substantially the same as those defended by Luther, the most remarkable being the following: Holy Scripture is the only source of faith; Christ is the true and only Head of the company of the saints, of God's elect; the authority of popes and bishops had its origin in pride and usurpation, and is wholly destitute of Gospel warrant or sanction; there is no Sacrifice other than that of Christ for the sins of the world, of which the Mass is only a commemoration; Christ being our only mediator, we have no need of the intercession of the saints; God alone having power to forgive sins, confession is only a method of giving and receiving counsel; the doctrine of purgatory is devoid of Scriptural proof; priests and monks have the same right as other men to take wives; the monk's habit is a device to cloak hypocrisy. At the close of the disputation, the Council of Zürich declared Zwingli the victor.

A second disputation was arranged for September of the same year, to which the bishops of Constance, Coire, and Basle, though invited to be present, refused either to go themselves, or to send representatives.

Zwingli and his confederates, *Leo Judæ* and *Hetzer*, the latter of whom was subsequently beheaded for his numerous adulteries, no rejected the use of images, abolished the Mass and clerical celibacy, and forthwith took wives, Zwingli marrying *Ann Reinhard*, a widow, with whom he had for many years maintained a criminal intercourse.

Accompanied by many of the magistrates and a number of masons and carpenters, Zwingli went the round of the churches of the city, demolishing images and statues, overturning altars, and destroying the very organs in their insane hatred of whatever called up the memory of the ancient faith. Not content with this, they tore the relics of saints from their shrines, and buried them away under ground. They would have neither music, lights, incense, nor external ceremony; for the magnificent and imposing grandeur of the Roman ritual they substituted a cold, cheerless worship, as repulsive as it was grotesque. A plain table took the place of the altar of sacrifice, and goblets of wine and a basket of bread were the human substitutes for the plate and chalice containing the Body and Blood of Christ. The texts of Scripture were read in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, after which the various readings were compared, and the correct sense, according to their understanding of it, evolved. The vernacular text in use until 1529 was a translation of Luther's New and Old Testaments, according to the Hebrew, made into *Switzero-German, and interpreted in a Zwinglian sense* by Leo Judæ.

These religious innovations, and the disturbances which they occasioned, excited the fears and called forth the protests of the Catholic members of the Grand Council, who were in consequence deprived of

their offices, *and forbidden to celebrate divine worship after the manner of their forefathers for countless generations.* These officials, together with representatives from various parts of Switzerland, to whom the recent events had given offence, assembled at *Lucerne*, in 1524, and appointed a deputation to go to Zürich to beg their brethren there not to contemn the faith of their venerable Mother, the Church, which they had cherished as a common heritage, and faithfully preserved for fifteen centuries. The deputies were further instructed to say that the assembly of Lucerne was ready to consult with the people of Zürich as to "the best means of shaking off the yoke which the injustice and unwarrantable violence of certain popes, cardinals, bishops, and prelates had laid upon the Swiss people, and of putting an end to the scandalous traffic in ecclesiastical benefices, indulgences, &c." But the Grand Council of Zürich, seeing that these innovations would lead to an increase of the public revenue and heighten the influence of their city in the Confederacy, refused to listen either to the voice of religion or to the appeals of brotherly love. The Council was encouraged in this decision by Zwingli, who, to secure the energetic protection of that body for himself, willingly yielded it, in turn, full exercise of episcopal jurisdiction, or, what was practically the same thing, a corresponding measure of authority in ecclesiastical affairs. He had soon occasion to invoke its aid, for the *Anabaptists*, great numbers of whom were now to be found in Switzerland, claimed, like Zwingli himself, the right of putting their own interpretation upon the Holy Scriptures. Holding that *infant baptism* had no sanction in Holy Writ, and was only an invention of the Papists, they came into conflict with Zwingli, with whom they had a discussion on the point. The Council decided that their teachings were erroneous, and forbade them, under penalty of death, to rebaptize. *Felix Manz*, disregarding the inhibition, continued the practice, was adjudged guilty, and put to death by drowning, in 1526; while his associate, *Blaurock*, a monk of Coire, was let off with a scourging.

At Basle, *Œcolampadius* proclaimed himself the champion of the new religious principles. He was born at Weinsberg, in Suabia, in 1482, and studied law at Bologna; but he subsequently relinquished the idea of following this profession, and began the study of theology at Heidelberg.

Appointed parish priest in the city of Basle, in 1515, he soon became intimate with the learned Erasmus, who highly appreciated his classical attainments. The works of Luther had been largely circulated in the city through the efforts of *Froben*, a bookseller. Moreover, *Wolfgang Capito*, a friend of Zwingli's and the leading priest of Basle, and *Reublin*, also a priest of the same place, had already shown leanings towards Lutheranism in their sermons, and preached against the Mass, purgatory, and the invocation of the saints. In 1516, Œcolampadius was appointed preacher of the Cathedral of Augsburg; but his feeble health preventing him from at once entering upon his duties he withdrew to Almünster, a convent at a short distance from

the city, where he remained for a brief period. When it became known that he was an advocate of the new teachings, he was invited to find some more congenial abode. He then became chaplain in the castle of *Franz von Sickingen*, where he introduced many innovations in religious worship, and after the death of that nobleman, in 1522, he again went back to Basle as a professor of theology, and, in 1524, was once more appointed parish priest. He now openly and boldly proclaimed his opposition to the teachings and usages of the Catholic Church, and, to give binding force to his new position, married a handsome young widow, who subsequently became successively *the wife of Capito and Bucer*. *William Farel*, a French nobleman, and the professors, *Simon Grynæus* and *Sebastian Münster*, became his powerful and effective allies.

The municipal authorities at first declared themselves hostile to any innovations, and instructed the reformers to await the action of a future council; but the partisans of Œcolampadius, refusing to abide by this decision, raised seditious tumults in the city, and in this way forcibly extorted freedom of worship (1527). Once secure in the possession and enjoyment of religious liberty for themselves, their next step, characteristically enough, was an attempt to withdraw it from Catholics, the total suppression of whose religion they clamorously demanded (February, 1529). Seizing the arsenal, they plundered it of its contents, and, having placed cannon in position on the principal squares of the city, they rushed into the churches like so many infuriated demons, and after having demolished altars, statues, and images, they made twelve piles of the church furniture and ornaments, and consumed them with fire. Disgusted at this brutal mode of reforming the Church, Erasmus quitted Basle, and took up his residence at Freiburg, in Brisgovia.[1]

Similar scenes were enacted in nearly every city of Switzerland—notably in *Mülhausen* (1524), *St. Gall* and *Schaffhausen* (1525), and *Appenzell* (1524). In the Canton of *Bern*, the most populous and powerful of the Swiss Confederation, an effort was made to correct abuses on the one hand, and on the other to keep out all innovations; but this conservative policy was wholly frustrated by a former disciple of Melanchthon's, *Berthold Haller*, a Suabian († 1536), then a popular parish priest of Bern, who, acting on the cunning and insidious advice of Zwingli[2] to another priest of Bern, finally succeeded in bringing

[1] *Herzog*, The Life of John Œcolampadius and the Reformation of the Church of Basle 2 Pts., Basle, 1843.—†*The Condition of Basle immediately before the Reformation, *Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIII., pp. 705-746 and 810-836; Vol. XIV., pp. 129-147, 273-291, and 377-392.

[2]†**C. L. de Haller*, Hist. of the Religious Revolution, or the Protestant Reformation in the Canton of Bern. Lucerne, 1836. Zwingli, in a letter to the priest Kolb of Bern, giving instructions as to the way to proceed in propagating the new teachings, speaks as follows: "My dear Francis: We should observe much caution in this affair. You will, therefore, give to these bears at first only one sour pear among a number of sweet ones; then add another and another, and when they begin to have a relish for them, increase the number, mixing sour and sweet; and, finally, empty the whole bag, hard and mellow, bitter and sweet; for, when they have once their heads fairly into the trough, they will not

the bulk of the people over to the teaching of Protestantism (1528). *Glarus*, *Soleure*, and *Freiburg* leaned in the same direction, and it soon became evident that the Protestant Cantons had a preponderating influence in the Confederation. Hence, the representatives of the Canton of Zürich peremptorily demanded that such of the Cantons as had not yet embraced the new faith, should be obliged to do so.

To this demand, *Lucerne*, the three original Cantons, viz., *Uri*, *Schwyz*, and *Unterwalden*, and the Canton of *Zug* made a heroic resistance, protesting that they would never abandon the faith of their fathers. It is a little remarkable that these Cantons were precisely the ones in which primitive simplicity of manners and purity of morals were still preserved, and whose inhabitants had but lately been witnesses of the holy life and miraculous deeds of *Nicholas of Flüe*. Their representatives declared over and over again that they had no jurisdiction over ecclesiastical affairs, and would never consent to assume any.

On the 21st of May, 1526, a disputation took place at Baden, in the Canton of Argovia, between *Eck* on the one side, and *Œcolampadius*, Zwingli's Melanchthon, and many more divines on the other, concerning the Mass, purgatory, and the veneration of the saints, in which, although it was plain the former had gained a complete triumph, the friends of the latter claimed a victory for their champion.[1] Its most important result, however, was the complete alienation of the Protestant from the Catholic Cantons, the latter of which, after having definitely, but reluctantly, joined those of *Freiburg* and *Soleure*, and entered into an alliance with King Ferdinand of Austria (1529), were driven by the outrages[2] of their opponents to retaliatory measures of more than usual severity, if indeed they do not merit a harsher name. The impending struggle was for the time averted by the mediation of the cities of Strasburg and Constance, and the Catholic Cantons in consequence broke off their treaty with Ferdinand; but, for all this, the popular feeling on each side was as deep and as hostile as ever. Hence, when the people of Zürich, under pretence of promoting the glory of God and forwarding the interests of the Christian faith, intercepted convoys of provisions destined for the Catholic Cantons, a furious war at once broke out. A battle was fought October 11, 1531, at Cappel, in which the army of Zürich suffered a disastrous defeat; and Zwingli, who, by the command of the magistracy, had gone to the field of battle as chaplain, and, clad in complete armour, had borne aloft the standard of the city, was stricken down, and numbered among the slain. Œcolampadius having been cut off by a malignant plague on the 23rd of November of the same year, the coincidence was

patiently suffer themselves to be driven away. Your servant in Christ, Ulrich Zwingli, Zürich, the Monday after St. George's Day, 1527."

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. III., p. 547-556; and *Wiedemann*, John Eck, p. 223.

[2] "The burning of images, and sometimes even of monasteries," *Hase* blandly tells us, "was of course exceedingly painful to the Catholic authorities, especially when it occurred in places subject to their control." Ch. Hist., Eng. trans., N. Y. 1875, p. 388. (Tr.)

remarked by the Lutherans, who observed, with brutal malevolence, that "the devil had given both of them a sudden taking off."

Zwingli was succeeded by *Henry Bullinger*, and Œcolampadius by *Oswald Myconius*,[1] who, together with *Leo Judæ*, *Caspar Grossman*, and *William Farel*, continued to spread the new doctrines in Switzerland.

§ 314. *Zwingli's System.*

"Uslegen und gründ der schlussreden oder Artikel"—Explanations and Reasons of the Conclusions or Articles,—veluti farrago omnium opinionum, quæ hodie controvertuntur (Zwinglii Opera, edd. Schuler et Schulthess, T. VII., p. 275 sq.) Comment. de vera et falsa religione, Tiguri, 1525; Fidei ratio ad Carolum imperatorem, Tig. 1530; Christianæ fidei brevis et clara Expositio ad Regem Christian. Francisc. I. (ed *Bullinger*), Tig. 1536, in Zw. opera, T. IV., p. 42-78; De providentia, in opp. T. I. *Zeller*, The Theological System of Zwingli, Tübg. 1853. *Spörri*, Studies on Zwinglianism, Zürich, 1866. *Schweizer*, The Fundamental Dogmas of the Protestants, Zürich, 1854. *Hagenbach*, Hist. of the First Confession of Basle, Basle, 1827. *Sigwart*, Ulrich Zwingli; the character of his Theology, Stuttgart, 1855. Besides the Symbolism of *Möhler* and *Hilgers*, cf. especially *Riffel*, Vol. III., p. 54-102. *Hundeshagen*, Suppl. to the character of Zwingli, along with a comparison to Luther and Calvin (Theol. Studies and Criticisms, 1862, nro. 4).

While Zwingli's claim to having been before Luther in publicly attacking the abuses that had crept into the Church may be allowed, his pretension to any originality of teaching must be emphatically denied. The underlying principles of his system were taken from the writings of Luther, which had been largely circulated in Switzerland shortly after their appearance in Germany, and he could claim as his own no more than a recasting and an adaptation of these principles to suit his own ways of thought and intellectual bent. That he was superficial, and destitute of intellectual gifts of a high order, is evident from the fact that he started by denying that Christianity had anything of mystery in it. The principle upon which his whole system was grounded, and out of which it grew with rigorous consistency, may be briefly stated as follows: *Holy Scripture is the one source of faith*, and man's reason its only interpreter; and, hence, whatever it contains that is above or beyond the comprehension of the human intellect, may be discarded. Zwingli, like all reformers, professed to believe himself divinely inspired, and to have merited by his earnest prayers a direct mental illumination. As regards *his specific teaching*, he held with Luther that man, *in consequence of the sin of Adam, had fallen so completely and hopelessly under the dominion of evil*, that every faculty of body and soul was impaired, and his every act vain, unprofitable, and sinful. Hence, man had no power to do good, and free-will is a fiction. Human nature, being in itself wholly and essentially wicked, evil deeds are as *necessarily* its product as are the branches of a tree the outgrowth of the stem. His *theory of Providence* (*De Providentia*), which is set forth in precise and emphatic terms, is only an extreme form of the fatalistic belief of the Pagans;

Oswald Myconius (i. e. Geisshäuter), Antistes of the Church of Basle, by Melchior *Kirchhofer*, Zürich, 1813. Biography of *M. Henry Bullinger* (he had been Dean of Bremgarton), Antistes of the Church of Zürich, by *Sal Hess*, Zürich, 1828 sq., 2 vols. (incomplete).

human free-will is totally annihilated: *God is represented as the author of sin, and seems to have a very decided preference for it in its more aggravated forms of treason and murder*![1] Starting with these wide and sweeping premises, he could accept *no theory of justification other than that of Luther by faith alone*, and no other was admissible. Consistently with his debasing theory of absolute predestination, he asserted and maintained that such distinguished Pagan personages as Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Numa Pompilius, the Catos and the Scipios were among the elect, and enjoyed the fellowship of Christ and His Saints —an opinion which, Luther said, made him a thoroughgoing Pagan.

Like Luther, Zwingli also *repudiated such works* as in his belief were not inspired by faith, and among these he included *monastic vows*, and everything connected with *indulgences* and *purgatory*. According to his definition, the Church, *whose members are known to God alone*, consists of that great community of Christians who recognize only Christ as their Head, He having no visible representative on earth. Hence the spiritual power of the Bishop of Rome, and of the bishops dispersed over the world, is neither more nor less than usurpation, it having been primarily lodged in the *civil authorities*, from whom it was extorted by the ecclesiastical hierarchy. *The Sacraments*, he said, are but empty signs, having no efficacy, conferring no grace, and are not even tokens of God's favour. They are a sort of advertisement to the public that those who receive them are already in the enjoyment of God's favour.[2] *Baptism* does not cleanse the soul of sin,[3] and make the recipient a son of God; but it is a sign of initiation for those who do not yet enjoy that sonship, and a pledge of continuance for those who do. The *Holy Eucharist* is not itself a sacrifice, but merely a commemoration of the expiatory Sacrifice of Christ, and, hence, the words of institution spoken by Christ are to be taken not in their literal and obvious sense, but in a sense wholly figurative.[4] "Moreover," said Zwingli, anticipating the *Calvinistic* interpretation of the words of institution, and replying to it, "those should not be listened to who say: 'We do indeed truly eat the flesh of Christ, but in a *spiritual sense*;' for," he added, "the assertion involves a contradiction of terms." *Confirmation* and *Extreme Unction* he dismissed from his mind as too trifling to claim his serious attention; and *Holy Orders*, he said, is only a

[1] Epist. an. 1527: Hic ergo proruunt quidam: "Libidini ergo indulgebo, etc.; quidquid egero, Deo auctore fit." Qui se voce produnt, cujus oves sint! Esto enim, Dei ordinatione fiat, ut hic parricida sit, etc.——ejusdem tamen bonitate fit, ut qui vasa iræ ipsius futuri sint, his signis prodantur, quum scilicet latrocinantur—citra pœnitentiam. Quid enim aliud quam gehennæ filium his signis deprehendimus? Dicant ergo, *Dei providentia se esse proditores ac homicidas!* Yet the caution is added further on: "Sed heus tu! caste ista ad populum et rarius etiam!" Cf. also *Hahn*, Zwingli's Doctrine of Providence, the nature and end of man, and also of the election of grace (Studies and Criticisms, 1837, 4th number, p. 765-805).

[2] "Ex quibus hoc colligitur, sacramenta dari *in signum publicum* ejus gratiæ, quæ cuique privato *prius* adest."

[3] Zwingli, Works, Vol. II., p. 198 b.; p. 477. (Tr.)

[4] A single passage will suffice to show his teaching: "Hoc est, id est, significat Corpus Meum. Quod perinde est, ac si quæ matrona conjugis sui annulum ab hoc ipso relictum monstrans, En conjux hic meus est, dicat. Ibid., Vol. II., p. 293. (Tr.)

ceremonial *induction* into the *ministry of the Word*, and neither confers grace nor imprints a sacramental character on the soul. For where is the good of these external means of grace, since the power of God is everywhere visible, *working* in and through all things, not indirectly and as employing agencies, but directly and absolutely; and if Christ, he went on to say, has instituted Baptism and the Eucharist as his *two* signs in the New Covenant, He did so only because *He graciously stooped to accommodate Himself to the weakness of our poor nature.*

Between the cold, barren system of Zwingli and the teachings of Luther,[1] there was nearly as great a contrast as between it and the *faith* of the Catholic Church; and the repulsive aridity of everything connected with Zwinglianism will, in a measure, account for the fact, that, while religious sentiment and warmth of feeling early died out among its professors, they long continued to manifest their presence among those of Lutheranism.

† § 315. *The Sacramentarian Controversy.* (Cf. § 311.)

Læscher, Complete History of the Struggle between Luther and the Reformed, Frankfurt and Lps., 2nd ed., 1723, 3 vols. *Lud. Lavater*, Historia de origine et progressu controversiæ de cœna Domini ab an. 1523-1563, Tiguri, 1564 and 1572. *Hospiniani*, Historia sacramentaria, Tig., 1598; 1602, 2 T. f., 1611, 4to. *Bossuet*, Hist. of Variations, Vol. I., p. 48 sq. *Planck*, Hist. of the Origin, Variations, etc. (Vol. II., p. 204 sq., 471 sq.; Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 376 sq.) By the *same*, Hist. of Protestant Theology (Vol. I., p. 6 sq.; Vol. II., Pt. I., p. 89 sq., Pt. II., p. 7 sq.; Vol. III., pp. 150, 274, and 732 sq.) *Mœhler*, Symbolism, chap. IV., p. 256 sq.; Engl. transl., p. 292 sq. *Hilgers*, Symbolism, chap. VI., §§ 27 and 28. **Riffel*, Vols. I. and II., pp. 298-335.

The principle of private judgment introduced by the Reformers, granting to all unrestricted freedom to teach what they liked, and to interpret Holy Scripture arbitrarily, necessarily led at a very early day to grave divisions among the sectaries themselves. Luther was seriously alarmed, and saw the importance of fixing upon some common creed as a basis of doctrine, and a guarantee of unity of teaching. Like Melanchthon, he had violently assailed the *Sacraments*, which, the Church has ever taught, are divinely ordained and efficacious instruments of grace; and, being under the necessity of so shaping and adjusting the details of his system that they would fit in with his fundamental principle of justification *by faith alone*, he denied the teaching of the Church, and affirmed that, instead of being positive means for conveying sanctifying grace to the soul, the Sacraments are no more than signs and symbols designed to strengthen the faith of the believer in the assurance that *he is loosed from his sin*. Hence, he insisted, whoever receives the divine promises with unhesitating faith, has no need of the Sacraments. Notwithstanding this general denial of efficacy to the Sacramental system, he still continued to teach that Christ is really and truly present in the Sacrament of the Altar,

[1] Hence Luther, replying to the Swiss deputies, said: "Either one party or the other must necessarily be working in the service of Satan; the matter does not admit of discussion, there is no possibility of compromise." *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 1907.

and, as to the mode of this Presence, he held for a time that the substances of bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. But his obstinate struggle against the Church, and his heated and acrimonious controversies with the *Sacramentarians*, led him before long to discard these views, and adopt others wholly at variance with them. *Carlstadt* had accepted the early teaching of Luther, and, in consequence, denied the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar, because, as he said, it was wholly destitute of Scriptural proof. Luther could not deny the logical justness of the conclusion, and in 1524, when these questions were beginning to create a stir, wrote as follows to Bucer: "Had Dr. Carlstadt, or anyone else, been able to persuade me five years ago that the Sacrament of the Altar is but bread and wine, he would indeed have done me a great service, and rendered very material aid in my efforts to make a breach in the Papacy. But it is all in vain; I cannot escape; the meaning of the text is too evident; every artifice of language will be powerless to explain it away."[1]

Pirkheimer,[2] who also contributed his share to the controversy in his "*De vera Christi carne et vero ejus sanguine ad J. Œcolampadium responsio*," stated in a letter to Melanchthon, that, in his opinion, Luther's true motive for reaffirming his belief in the Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament, apart from his natural inclination to contradict everybody, was a desire to achieve a victory over Carlstadt. There seems to be some truth in the statement, for Luther declared that he would continue to believe, in spite of the Papists, that the Sacrament of the Altar was only bread and wine; and, in spite of Carlstadt, he would continue to raise the Host aloft for the adoration of the people, lest it might seem the devil had taught him a new lesson. *If a council were to prescribe*, he added, *or to allow Communion under both kinds, he would, only for the sake of being in opposition to such council, admit but one, and utter anathema upon those who, in obedience to the conciliar decrees, should receive under both kinds*.[3] Luther was annoyed that Carlstadt should put precisely the same meaning as himself upon the words of institution; the more so, since the latter had on a former occasion, in explaining the sense of the passage in Matthew, xvi. 18, declared that, in instituting the Blessed Sacrament, *Christ had pointed to his own Body*, and that the pronoun τοῦτο properly referred to σῶμα, and not to ἄρτος. In like manner, Carlstadt explained the awful words of St. Paul: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Body of

[1] *Walch*, Luther's *Works*, Vol. XV., p. 2448. Cf. *Gœbel*, Andrew Bodenstein's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper (Studies and Criticisms, 1842, nro. 2). *Aschbach's* Eccl. Cyclopæd., art. "Karlstadt."

[2] *Hagen*, The Literary and Religious Relations of Germany during the Age of the Reformation, with a special reference to *Willibald Pirkheimer*, Vol. I., Erlangen, 1841. *Charitas Pirkheimer*, Abbess of Nürnberg (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIII., pp. 513-539; cf. Vol. XLIV., two articles). *Hæfler*, Charitas Pirkheimer, etc., Memoirs of the Age of the Reformation, Bamberg, 1852. *Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. I., p. 167 sq. *Wm. Loose*, Episodes of the Life of Charitas Pirkheimer, Dresden, 1870.

[3] See his Ordinary of the Mass, 1523.

the Lord,"[1] as conveying only an admonition to the faithful to celebrate the Lord's Supper with gravity and becoming reverence, and to exclude all unseemly hilarity and vulgar carousing. The restraints which publication necessarily imposed upon the two champions were broken through, and gave place to coarse abuse when they came into personal contact with each other. Luther never gave over pursuing Carlstadt, the preacher of Orlamünde, from the day the latter had been driven from the gates of Wittenberg. He went to Jena, and, ascending the pulpit, occupied on the previous day by Carlstadt, greatly amused his audience by his ironical flings at the fanatics. Carlstadt was present, and, stung by the raillery of Luther, at once challenged him to a discussion. They met in the *Black Bear inn of Jena*,[2] and the argument continuing to grow more animated and heated, they finally transgressed every law of propriety and decency, and discussed the most sacred of subjects—the *Lord's Supper*—in a manner the most frivolous, and in language the most unbecoming. In closing, both pledged themselves to carry on the controversy in writing. "Will you write openly against me, Doctor?" asked Luther. "Yes," replied Carlstadt, "if it is agreeable to you, and I shall not spare you." "Good," rejoined Luther; "there, Doctor, is a florin as an earnest." "May I see you broken on a wheel," said Luther, on taking leave of Carlstadt; "And may you," retorted the latter, "break your neck before you get out of the city." Carlstadt escaped personal violence only by precipitate flight, "and thus," it was said, "was Andrew Bodenstein driven away by Luther without a hearing." He repaired to Strasburg, where he made *Bucer* and *Capito* his allies in his quarrel with Luther. After the close of the *Peasants' War*, in which he had taken part, he humbly sued for Luther's pardon, and, retiring to the small town of Kemberg, set up as a haberdasher, and for a season ceased to give much attention to polemical controversy. But selling small wares was not to his taste, and in 1528 he once more came forth from his obscurity, again assailed Luther, and was again obliged to quit Saxony. Through the influence of Zwingli, he was granted an asylum in Switzerland (1530), and was set over a parish, and, still later on, became a professor and preacher in Basle, where, as already stated, he was stricken by a plague, and died in 1541.[3]

But if Carlstadt had passed away, his errors lived after him, and *Zwingli* and *Œcolampadius* promptly proclaimed and publicly defended them as their own. Like *Berengarius* in a former age,[4] they put an erroneous interpretation upon the words of institution, Zwingli maintaining, on the authority of Exodus, xii. 11, "For it (i. e., the Paschal Lamb) is the Phase, that is, the Passage of the Lord," and other texts

[1] 1 Cor., xi. 29.

[2] *Martin Reinhardt*, who was present, gives a detailed account of the debate in *Actis Jenensibus;* see *Walch*, T. XV., p. 2423. Cf. *C. A. Menzel*, German Hist., Vol. I., p. 254 sq.

[3] *Jæger*, Andrew Bodenstein of Carlstadt, Stuttg., 1856.

[4] See Vol. II., p. 319, note.

of Scripture, that the copula "*is*" means "*signifies*;" and Œcolampadius, that the Predicate, "*Body*," means "*symbol*" or "*sign*" of the Body.

In the meantime, fourteen Suabian preachers had published, above their collective names, a document (*Syngramma*), written by *Brenz* of Hall and *Erhard Schnepf* of Wimpfen, in which, while professedly inclining to the Lutheran belief, they seemed to favour the teaching of Zwingli, inasmuch as they held that the Body of Christ, though not really present in the sacramental species, may become so in obedience to the faith of the worshipper. *Capito* and *Bucer* at once saw that the meaning of the "Syngramma" was loose and equivocal, and hoped, by a skilful interpretation of its doubtful passages to furnish a common ground on which the conflicting parties might agree. But Luther refused to listen to any such compromise. When it was proposed to him, he flew into a towering passion, raving incoherently against Zwingli and his partisans, "*who*," he said, "*were Sacramentarians and ministers of Satan, against whom no exercise of severity however great, would be excessive.*" The works published by Luther at this time against the Sacramentarians[1] are the most solid of all his writings. As long as he devotes his energies to defending the teachings of the ancient faith, instead of assailing them, his style is spirited and vigorous, his proofs clear, and, in many instances, apposite, and his reasoning luminous and conclusive; and for the simple, but potent, reason, that he has the unchangeable Church at his back.

While accepting the words of institution in their literal and strict sense, Luther discarded the Catholic dogma of Transubstantiation, and instead adopted one of his own, known as *Con*substantiation, or *Impanation*, according to which the Body of Christ is received *in*, *under*, and *with* the bread (*in, sub, et cum pane*). This theory he supported by the authority of certain theologians, according to whom the *body* of Christ, because of its union with his divinity, is omnipresent (*Ubiquity*). Zwingli argued, in reply,[2] that if a strictly literal interpretation were to be put upon the words of institution, then no meaning could be drawn from them other than that contained in the Catholic dogma of Transubstantiation; but that if, on the other hand, the words: "*This is My Body*," were to be interpreted as meaning: "*This contains My Body*," or, "*This bread is united with My Body*," then, he would ask, in what Luther's *synecdoche* was more tenable or more reasonable than his own *metonymy*. He further contended that the theory of *bodily ubiquity*, in which Luther sought refuge, was subversive of the doctrine of two natures in Christ, and a revival, under

[1] *a.* Against the celestial Prophets, in *Walch*, Vol. XX., p. 186 sq. *b.* Sermon on the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ against the Visionaries, in *Walch*, Vol. XX., p. 915 sq. *c.* That the words of Christ: "*This is My Body*," are to be retained against the visionaries, in *Walch*, T. XX., p. 950 sq. *d.* Great Confession of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, *Walch*, Vol. XX., p. 1118 sq.

"It would require an extraordinary lesson in language," said Zwingli, "to persuade me that the words: '*This is My Body*,' are synonymous with the expression: '*My Body is eaten in this bread*,'" &c. *Walch*, Vol. XX., p. 658.

another form, of the Monophysite error. Zwingli complained bitterly of Luther's excessive violence against the Sacramentarians. "You cry out that we are heretics," said he, "and should be denied a hearing; you proscribe our books, and denounce us to the magistrates. Is not this doing precisely what the Pope did formerly when truth began to raise her head?"[1]

The controversies and bickerings among the Reformers themselves concerning the most essential truths of Christianity, had at least one good effect: they proved the utter inefficiency and fallaciousness of the principle of private interpretation, which invested every one with the absolute right of construing Scriptural texts after his own fashion, on the ground that their meaning is so very clear that one cannot possibly mistake it. The advocates of both parties were obliged to appeal to the tradition of the Church, against which both had intemperately declaimed; and to seek to add weight to their individual opinions, by professing to rest them upon the writings of her Doctors, whose authority Luther had contemptuously rejected.[2] Writing, in 1532, to Albert of Prussia[3] on the question in dispute between himself and the Zwinglians, Luther said: "This article is neither unscriptural nor a dogma of human invention; it is based upon the clear and irrefragable words of Holy Writ; it has been uniformly held and believed throughout the whole Christian world, from the foundation of the Church to the present hour. That such has been and is the fact, is attested by the writings of the *Holy Fathers*, both Greek and Latin, by daily usage, and the

[1] Cf. § 311, vers. fin.

[2] "All the Fathers," said Luther, "fell into error, and those of them that did not repent before dying are lost eternally." . . . "Their writings are fetid pools, whence Christians have been drinking unwholesome draughts, instead of slaking their thirst from the pure fountain of Holy Scripture." . . . "*St. Gregory* was the first to start the fictions concerning Purgatory and Masses for the dead, and is the author of the whole of them. He knew very little about either Christ or the Gospel, and was so superstitious as to be easily deceived by the Devil." . . . "*St. Augustine* often fell into error, and cannot be safely followed. He was a good, holy man; but, like the other Fathers, did not possess the true faith." . . . "*Jerome* I regard as a heretic. He wrote many impious things, and deserves to be in hell rather than heaven. I know none of the Fathers whom I so much dislike. He is eternally gabbling about fasting and virginity." . . . "*Chrysostom* is a sorry fellow, an empty declaimer, who has filled many books with pretentious trifles, which, when examined, are found to be only a mass of barren and undigested matter—a great puff of smoke and little fire." . . . "*Basil* is worthless; he is a monk through and through, and, to my mind, he is of no weight whatever." . . . "The Apology of Melanchthon is superior to anything the Doctors of the Church, not excepting Augustine, ever wrote." . . . "Nihil ad nos *Thomas Aquinas;* he is a theological abortion, a fount of error, whence issue all the heresies that subvert Gospel teaching." (These sententious expressions of Luther may be found scattered here and there—some in his *Table-Talk*, Frankfurt ed., No. 57, and some in his other works. They are given precisely as found in the several editions of his works as collated by *Weislinger*, in Friss Vogel oder Stirb—*Neck or Nothing*—Strasburg, 1726, pp. 300, 314, and other places.) Cf. also *Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. I., p. 430-451.

[3] *Luther's* letters against certain intriguers, addressed to Albert, Margrave of Brandenburg (1532), in *Walch*, Vol. XX., p. 2089. *Faber* wrote a whole book on this contradiction in Luther: De Antilogiis Lutheri. Cf. *Raynald*, ad an. 1531, nro. 57, and *Cochlæus*, Lutherus septiceps ubique sibi, suis scriptis contrarius, Paris, 1564. Cf. *Frint's* Theological Review, years 1812 and 1813; and *Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 336, and Vol., XI., p. 413.

uninterrupted practice of the Church. . . . Were it, indeed, a new doctrine, or had it been less uniformly observed in every church throughout the whole of Christendom (or, what is the same thing, had it not the fullest testimony of the most unexceptionable Catholic tradition on its side), to call it in question, or controvert it, would not be so dreadful a matter or so dangerous. . . . To doubt it, therefore, is to disbelieve the Christian Church, and to brand her as heretical and with her the prophets, apostles, and Christ Himself, who, in establishing his Church, said: 'Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world;'[1] to which the Apostle of the Gentiles added: this 'is the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.'"[2]

And speaking of the *rationalizing* tendencies of Zwingli's teaching, he said: "Were our Lord to spread wild apples before me, and bid me eat this one or that (as his Body), I should not venture to inquire the reason for doing his bidding." Again, forecasting its inevitable consequences, he uttered these prophetic words: "If the reason be allowed unrestricted freedom in criticising and passing judgment upon God's word and works, not a single article of faith will long survive. . . . In such an event, it will soon become apparent that the Zwinglian principles tend not to God's honour and a simple acceptance of his word by faith, but to the formation and fostering of sophistical, captious, and subtle habits of mind, leading directly to a denial of the *Divinity of Christ;* for it is no less unreasonable to say that *man is God*, than to affirm that *bread is changed into the Body* of the Lord."

The course pursued by Melanchthon in this controversy was very damaging to his character for manliness and honesty; for, while hypocritically professing to hold Luther's views on the Lord's Supper, and openly setting them forth in the Augsburg Confession as his own, he in truth favoured those of Calvin, as is abundantly shown from the language used by him after Luther's death.[3]

C.—Continuation of the History of the Reformation until the Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555).

§ 316. *Progress of Protestantism until the Interim of Ratisbon* (1541).

Le Plat, Monuments pour servir à l'histoire du Concile de Trente, T. II. and III., *Læmmer*, Monum. Vatic., p. 195 sq. *Riffel*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 480-580. A *Menzel*, Vol. II., p. 17-254.

The last act of both the Catholic and the Protestant parties, at the conclusion of the Religious Peace of Nürnberg, was to mutually and

[1] Matt. xxviii. 10. [2] 1 Tim. iii. 15.

[3] In the Confessio invariata, they say: "De cœna Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi *vere adsint* et *distribuantur* vescentibus in cœna Domini, et *improbant secus docentes.*" Here, according to *Salig*, Complete History of the Augsburg Confession, Vol. III., ch. 1, p. 171, there were left out after "Christi" the words: "sub specie panis et vini;" while in the *Variata* the following substitute is found: "De cœna Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere *exhibeantur* corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in coena Domini."

solemnly bind themselves to hold a Council at the earliest possible moment. Clement VII., acting upon this pledge, exerted himself to the utmost to have the oft-promised Council convene; but notwithstanding his best efforts, it was again delayed. Conditions were proposed, which the Protestants rejected on pretexts at once novel and futile.[1] To hold the Council in a *church*, according to time-honoured custom, they said, would be inconvenient; neither could they bind themselves to the unqualified acceptance and observance of its decrees. They further objected to having it convened at Milan, Bologna, or Piacenza, preferring some city of Germany. Other objections, equally trivial and evasive, were advanced.

After the death of Clement VII., September 25, 1534, his successor, *Paul III.* (October 13, 1534—November 10, 1549), made renewed and still more strenuous efforts to have the Council convene. Through his Nuncio, *Vergerius*, he opened negotiations with the Protestants, and issued a decree of convocation, designating May, 1537, as the time, and Mantua as the place, of holding the Council.[2] Again the Protestants, assembled at Schmalkald, in December, 1535, refused to take any part in it, fully accepting as their own the opinion of Luther, "that the Catholics were not serious in their professions to hold a Council; while the Protestants, being perfectly enlightened upon all points by the Holy Ghost, had no need of it." They went on to express their conviction that a Council, whose methods and forms of procedure should be directed by the Pope, could not be free, and that the Pope himself and his cardinals should be impeached. The more proper way, they said, would be to have men of known ability and unbiassed minds, selected by the princes from *every condition* of life, who, recognizing no *rule or authority other than the word of God*, should examine and pass judgment on the questions in dispute.[3]

The war, which had in the meantime broken out between the emperor and Francis I., inasmuch as it rendered a journey to Mantua difficult, if not hazardous, furnished the Protestants a fresh pretext for declining to be present at the Council. The League of Schmalkald, renewed on this occasion for the space of ten years, was strengthened by many fresh accessions, in defiance of the prohibitions of the articles of the Peace of Nürnberg. While, on the one hand, the Protestants were extremely mortified at seeing the proposed alliance between France and England frustrated; on the other, they had every reason to congratulate themselves on the favourable dispositions of the new Elector of Saxony, Frederic the Magnanimous, and on the accession to the League

[1] For an account of the measures taken by him immediately after the Diet of Augsburg, cf. *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1530, nros. 175, 176. Cf., moreover, *ibid.* Ad an. 1533, nros. 3-8, and *Walch*, Vol. XVI., pp. 2263, 2281; *De Wette*, T. IV., p. 454.

[2] Cf. *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1535, nros. 26, 30, 32. *Paul's* Encyclica to divers princes, *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 2290 sq. *Melanchthonis*, Opp., ed. *Bretschneider*, T. II., p. 962 sq. *Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. III., c. 17 and 18.—The circular convoking the Council, on June 2, 1536, in *Raynald*, Ad an. 1536, nr. 35. Cf. *Pallavicini*, L. cit., lib. III., c 19. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., pp. 606-609; Fr. tr., Vol. 25, pp. 1-4, concerning Paul Vergerius, who afterwards became an apostate. *Lämmer*, Monum, Vatic., p. 146. sq.

[3] Cf *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 2305 sq.

of the Dukes Ulrich of *Würtemberg* and Barnim and Philip of *Pomerania;* of Robert, Count Palatine of *Zweibrücken;* of the Princes George and Joachim of *Anhalt;* of William, Count of *Nassau*, and of many cities of Germany. Moreover, *Denmark*, a country in which Protestant propagandists had been actively at work since the year 1536, began to manifest such signs as led to a well-founded hope that she also would soon enter the League.

As the time for holding the Council drew near, the Protestants again assembled at *Schmalkald* (February, 1537), and denounced the Pope in language more violent than they had ever before employed. After the publication of Luther's thirty propositions against the authority of Councils, the League subscribed the twenty-three articles of guarantee drawn up by him at Wittenberg in the preceding year, and known as the *Articles of Schmalkald;*[1] which, while expressing in precise and energetic language the violent hostility of the League against the Catholic Church, present a striking contrast with the Augsburg Confession. Moreover, Melanchthon was commissioned to prepare a treatise on the Primacy of the Pope and the Jurisdiction of Bishops (*De potestate et Primatu Papæ*); but his views, when submitted to the theologians assembled at Schmalkald, were coldly received, being much too temperate to harmonize with their radical designs. Melanchthon had said, in substance, that the Primacy of the Pope and the jurisdiction of bishops, though not of *divine*, were of *human institution* (*jure humano*), and should therefore continue to be retained. The aim and purpose of this treatise was to furnish arguments to those who still cared to attempt a justification of their conduct in renouncing all obligations of obedience to either Pope or bishops. Luther, broken in health and pained by the position taken by his old friend, quitted Schmalkald with these parting words: "*May God fill you with hatred of the Pope.*" From this time forth, the members of the League of Schmalkald were unanimous in their explicit and positive refusal to attend any Council whatever.[2]

Through the efforts of *Held*, Vice-Chancellor to the emperor, a confederation known as the *Holy League*,[3] whose object was to oppose the League of Schmalkald, was formed by the Catholic princes at Nürnberg, in June, 1538. Its members were the Archbishops of Mentz and Salzburg, the Duke of Bavaria, George of Saxony, and Henry of Brunswick. In the meantime, the foreign wars, in which the emperor was engaged, continued to divide his attention and weaken his authority at home. The Protestant League received, in 1538, a fresh

1 Articuli qui dicuntur Smalcaldici e Palatino Codice MS. (Luther's autograph manuscript) accurate editi et annotationibus crit. illustrati, per *Marheineke*, Berol., 1817, 4to. De potestate et primatu Papæ tractatus (now serving as an Appendix to the Articles of Schmalkald), in *Melanchthonis*, Opp., ed. Bretschneider, T. III., p. 271. Both are found together in *Hase*, Libri Symbol., p. 298-358.

2 *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 2426 sq. *Corp, Ref.*, Vol., pp. 962 sq., 982 sq. (Tr.)

3 The official documents are in *Hortleder*, Pt. I., Book 1, ch. 25-29; *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 2426 sq.; cf. *Riffel*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 523-526.

accession of strength in the Swiss,[1] with whom, owing to the adroit diplomacy of Bucer and Capito and the demand of the Protestant princes, Luther finally consented to unite on the basis of the *Concordia Vitebergensis*.

Joachim II., Elector of *Brandenburg*,[2] unmindful of the example of his illustrious father, embraced the new teachings in 1539, thus following in the footsteps of his brother, John, Margrave of *Neumark*, who had apostatized three years before. Protestantism was also introduced into the *Duchy of Saxony* by Henry, the brother and successor of Duke George, against the will and in spite of the protests of his subjects.[3] Luther was still indefatigable in his efforts to excite the hatred of the people against both Church and Council, and to this end continued to put forth hostile pamphlets of every size with unwearied activity and marvellous rapidity. It required all the terrors inspired by the recent victories of the Turks, who were now seriously menacing the whole of Germany, to temporarily suspend this religious war. Negotiations were opened at Frankfurt, in February, 1539, which resulted in the conclusion of an armistice for sixteen months.[4] The emperor, anxious to profit by this interval of peace to effect a reconciliation, summoned the theologians of both parties to a *Religious Conference* at Spire; but an epidemic prevailing in that city, it was transferred to Haguenau (June, 1540), whence it was again transferred to *Worms*, where, owing to the inexcusable delays caused by the Protestants, it was not finally opened until January 14, 1541.[5] Eck and Melanchthon led off in the discussion, taking as common ground the Confession of Augsburg—a circumstance which gave but poor promise of any ultimate satisfactory result. But, in the meantime, the emperor dissolved the Conference, and summoned a Diet to meet at Ratisbon, April 5, 1541, whither the celebrated Cardinal *Contarini*[6] repaired to take part in the discussion. To facilitate the adjustment of matters, a committee was appointed by the emperor, consisting of three theologians from each side. *Eck*, *Julius Pflug*, and *John Gropper* represented the Catholics, and *Melanchthon*, *Pistorius*, and *Bucer* the Protestants. The emperor implored them to lay aside

[1] Cf. *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 2543; the *Concordia*, written out by Melanchthon, in his Opp. ed., Bretsch., T. III., p. 75.

[2] Joachim II., Elector of Brandenburg (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, 1851, Vol. XXVIII., p. 291 sq.) *Adam Müller*, Hist. of the Reformation in the Margravate of Brandenburg, Berlin, 1839. *Spiecker*, Hist. of the Introd. of the Reform. in the March of Brandenburg, Berlin, 1839 sq., 3 Pts. Cf. *Riffel*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 682-703.

[3] *Hoffmann*, Complete Hist. of the Reformation in the City and University of Leipsig, Lps., 1739. *Leo*, Hist. of the Reform. in Leipsig and Dresden, Lps., 1834. *Von Langenn*, Maurice, Duke and Elector of Saxony, Lps., 1841, 2 vols. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. II., pp. 674-681.

[4] The public document is in *Hortleder*, Pt. I., Bk. 1, ch. 32; *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 396 sq.

[5] *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1540, nro. 15-24; *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 453 sq.; *Melanchthonis*, Opp. ed. Bretschneider, T. IV., p. 1 sq. The first opinion of *Cochlæus*, in *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1540, nro. 49. Cf. nros. 54 and 55.

[6] *Pallavicini*, L. c., lib. III., c. 12-15; Acta in conventu Ratisbonensi, ed. Melanchthon Viteb., 1541. Cf. *ejusdem*, Opp. ed. Bretschneider, T. IV., p. 119 sq.; *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 695 sq.; *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 549 sq.

all human prejudices and passions, and for the time being to have in view only the glory of God; and, with the purpose of narrowing the controversy down to essential matters, sent them, through Cardinal *Granvelle*, a treatise which should serve them as a basis and guide in their discussions. This treatise was probably the production of Gropper, and came to be known as the *Ratisbon Interim*.[1] Had it been a *political* paper, and intended for *political* purposes, its plans and suggestions for compromise would have merited, and doubtlessly received, the praise of having been astutely conceived; but judged from a religious point of view, which was its supposed character, it must be said that it set forth the teachings of faith neither clearly nor accurately, and was in consequence severely animadverted upon by the Catholic theologians, notably by Dr. Eck. In spite of this untoward circumstance, it seemed for a time that the Conference would have a happy issue. The conditions of the *Interim* were moderate, and both parties seemed more and more disposed for a reconciliation. But appearances were fallacious, and real difficulties were just as much difficulties as ever, as both parties learned once they came to discuss the fundamental article *on the Church* and the doctrine of *satisfaction*. Whatever may have been the dispositions of the Protestant divines relative to *auricular confession* and *transubstantiation*, when left to themselves, and these were by no means favourable, they absolutely refused to accept either after they had been re-enforced by the strictly orthodox Lutheran, *Amsdorf*, whom the Elector of Saxony sent to them as an adviser. They gradually drifted into old traditions and methods, and in the end began to demand the abolition of penitential exercises, good works, monastic vows, indulgences, the veneration of saints, and, in short, everything which in their opinion detracted from the merits of Christ. The Catholic theologians, of course, refused to yield to their demands, and this Conference, like all those that had preceded it, closed without having effected anything.

By the recess of the Diet it was ordained that both parties should continue to observe the articles to which they had already agreed, until such time as either a Council or a Diet could be held, with the concurrence of the Pope; that in the interval the Peace of Nürnberg should be observed in every particular; and, as a consequence, that all monastic churches should be secure from all manner of violence. The emperor also relaxed somewhat the conditions of the recess of the Diet of Augsburg, by suspending all suits at law pending in the Imperial Court of Justice against those whose title to enjoy the privileges of the Peace of Nürnberg was doubtful.[2] But even these concessions did not satisfy the Protestants, who continued to make still larger demands, which the emperor, though he thought them extravagant, was forced to grant, in order to secure their aid against the Turks.

[1] *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 725 sq.; *Riffel*, Vol. II., pp. 551-571; as to Eck's opinion on the Interim, ibid., p. 571, note 1. Cf. also *Unionsmacherei*, i. e., Bungling at Union-making (Review of Lutheran Divinity, 1856, nro. 2).

[2] Cf. *Walch*, Vol. XVII., pp. 962-1000.

§ 317. *The Anabaptists at Münster—Bigamy of the Landgrave, Philip of Hesse.*

† *Herm. a Kerssenbroik,* Anabapt. furoris hist. narratio, 1564-1573 (incomplete); *Menken,* Script. Germ., T. III., translated from the manuscript and published at Frankfurt (Münster), 1771, 4to. According to this, *Jochmus,* Hist. of the Reform. at Münster and its Failure caused by the Anabaptists, Münster, 1836. *Fæsser,* Hist. of the Anabaptists, Münster (1852), 1861. *Cornelius,* The Humanists of Münster and their Relations to the Reformation, Münster, 1851. By the *same,* Supplements to the Hist. of the Anabaptists, Münster, 1853, and Hist. of the Rebellion of Münster, Lps., 1855 sq. Again by the *same,* The Anabaptists of the Netherlands during the siege of Münster, from 1534-1535 (Essay read in the Munich Academy, 1870, Vol. I., Pt. II., pp. 50-111). *Hase,* The Kingdom of the Anabaptists (new prophets, 2nd ed., nro. 3), Lps., 1861. *Kampschulte,* Introd. of Protestantism into the Territory of what at present constitutes the Province of Westphalia, Paderborn, 1866. *Riffel,* Vol. II., p. 580.

Up to the date of the holding of the Diet of Augsburg, Westphalia, acting from purely political motives, had uniformly repelled[1] the persistent and frequent attempts made to introduce Lutheran errors within its borders. But the partisans of Luther, inspired with fresh courage by the action of the League of Schmalkald, grew daily more bold and aggressive; and one of them, *Bernard Rottmann,* chaplain of St. Maurice, near Münster, a visionary and a fanatic, enjoys the distinction of having first preached the new teachings in the streets of that city (February 23, 1532), and, having communicated to the citizens somewhat of his own fanaticism, prevailed upon them to pull down the altars in the churches and to demolish the images of the saints. With the connivance of the magistracy and the active support of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Protestantism was formally introduced into Münster, as it had already been into the cities of Minden, Herford, Lemgo, Lippstadt, and Soest, and the Catholics were in consequence forced to surrender six of their churches to the victorious sectaries (February 14, 1533).

But the triumphs thus gained by the Protestants were lost, and their further progress retarded for long years, through the *religious* and *political fanaticism* of the Anabaptists, who, finding this new field open to heretical error and sectarian propagandism, and flocking thither in hordes, gave themselves up to every sort of excess and outrage. These sectaries, who began their career of fanaticism at Zwickau, and were generally believed to have been annihilated in the Peasants' War, had scattered themselves over various countries, where they existed in large numbers, and, having neither home nor permanent abode, committed the wildest extravagances. Whilst, on the one hand, the Lutherans abused the liberty which they invoked as their proudest privilege, and made it a synonym for licentiousness; the Anabaptists, on the other, made a pretence of mortifying and crushing out whatever is human in our common natures. Entitled

[1] See the account of their wants given in the *Hist. Polit. Papers,* under the heading "Protestantism at Münster," Vol. IX., pp. 99-108, 129-158, 327-360; and Vol. X., pp. 42-45, 129-146.

on more than one score to the honour of being the legitimate heirs of the *dualistic Gnostics* and *visionary Montanists* of the early Church, they aspired to a false and extravagant *illuminism*, despised the Sacraments, reprobated all external practices, rejected the established institutions of the Church, and appealed to the Book of Revelations for a confirmation of their pretended millennial ecstasies, which, they claimed, had been revealed to them in fanciful visions and imaginary reveries. One of the most ardent champions of these teachings was *Melchior Hoffman* of Suabia, who exerted his best energies to propagate them in the Netherlands.[1]

John Bockelsohn, a tailor of Leyden, usually called *John of Leyden*, and *Matthiesen*, a baker of Haarlem, going to Münster, found an able and active coadjutor in the Protestant chaplain, Bernard Rottman. Having, with the aid of their adherents, made themselves masters of the city, they set up a *theocratic Democracy*, and proclaimed John of Leyden its autocratic king, while *Matthiesen* assumed the title and office of prophet, and *Knipperdolling*, a burgher, was named high sheriff and general-in-chief of the *Hosts of the Lord*. Twelve judges, constituting a court of justice, surrounded the newly-erected throne, and the city of Münster was designated as the "*City of Sion*," whence was to go forth the *Millennium* of Christ's visible kingdom on earth. Matthiesen, in his office of prophet, and claiming a direct revelation from on high as the sanction of his conduct, ordered all books and manuscripts other than the Bible, and all paintings and images of saints, which he designated as "instruments of Popish idolatry," to be destroyed, and they were accordingly committed to the flames amid profane dances and scenes of revolting profligacy and fanatical licentiousness. John of Leyden surrounded his newly-erected throne with Oriental pomp and magnificence. He was attended by a numerous guard, and a brilliant court lent lustre to his ephemeral reign. By divine command, so he blasphemously said, he took *several wives*, and polygamy, having the sanction of his illustrious example, became as general among these fanatical enthusiasts as the practice of possessing their goods in common. They were intolerant of opposition, and put down any show of resistance to their institutions by force and violence. Nor was their insolence confined by the narrow limits in which they held supreme sway. John issued a manifesto, in which he pompously proclaimed his intention to take the field, and, in the name of the Lord, to exterminate all the tyrants of the earth. Assured of a victorious triumph in this undertaking, he parcelled out in advance, among his followers, the duchies, bishoprics, and abbeys, situated immediately about Münster. To *John Denker*, a shopkeeper, he assigned the Duchy of Saxony; and the Duchy of Brunswick to *Bernard Thomas Moer*, a tailor; while the Duchy of Westphalia, together with the territories lying between the Weser and the Rhine, was conferred upon the patrician, *Christian Kerkerink*. Other royal

[1] See *Fæsser*, L. c., p. 84.

grants, equally munificent and grotesque, were made to his followers and ceased only when his imaginary conquests had been entirely disposed of. He further announced that should anyone—be he prince, magistrate, or burgher—refuse to receive the apostles sent out by him, he would come himself to destroy and utterly annihilate all such refractory spirits. But before John had time to carry into effect his splendid promises and terrible threats, Count Waldeck, the Bishop and temporal lord of Münster, assisted by many Protestant princes, succeeded in putting a period to the frightful scenes that were daily disgracing the city. The princes at the head of the Catholic army, which had now sat down before the gates of Münster, having summoned John to surrender, received the following reply: "Your favour and your clemency we despise—they are only another name for tyranny. We are content with the favour and assistance of our Heavenly Father, of which we are assured, and hence the offer of clemency by you, who stand in greater need of ours, is blasphemous. Understand, therefore, that it is our firm purpose to defend our religion and our city with the last drop of our blood." Every expedient was resorted to in order to rouse the courage of the multitude, and inspire them with enthusiasm. The preacher Rolle, King John, and many more, rushed like maniacs through the streets of the city, filling the air with cries of lamentation, and calling upon their followers to do "*penance*," and upon the godless to be rebaptized. One of these excited visionaries declared that he had seen Christ coming in the clouds, bearing aloft the standard of victory, and so general did the excitement become, that it finally reached all classes, and every age and sex; and *Tilbek*, the chief burgomaster, bending before the fury of popular fanaticism, requested to be again baptized. Matters grew daily worse, until, in the end, such as would not submit to be rebaptized were expelled the city. King John prepared a great *federal banquet* for his followers, which was served on the public square before the Cathedral, and to which eight thousand persons sat down. The city made a gallant defence, and it was only after *eighteen* months of incessant struggle that the besiegers succeeded in carrying it by storm (June 25, 1535). John of Leyden, Knipperdolling, and the chancellor, Krechting, after being subjected to every sort of ignominy and outrage, were executed with painful torture (January 23, 1536), and their bodies, incased in iron cages, were for years afterwards hung by iron chains from the steeple of St. Lambert's church, as a warning to the citizens. By the capture of Münster and execution of the Anabaptist leaders, the sect ceased to exist as on organized body, although its errors were long cherished and advocated by obscure and insignificant communities scattered up and down Westphalia.

But polygamy, their characteristic institution, found favour in other quarters. Among those to whom this Oriental institution was particularly acceptable, *Philip, Landgrave of Hesse*, surnamed *the Magnanimous*, and the most ardent advocate and zealous defender of the

Reformation, was notably conspicuous.[1] He had been married sixteen years to Christina, daughter of George of Saxony, and was the father of eight children; but it was notorious that he lived in habitual adultery during the whole of this time. Unable to stifle the voice of conscience, and unwilling to leave off his old habits of sin, he sought refuge in the convenient Lutheran tenet of "*salvation by faith alone.*" Having thus put the claims of conscience summarily aside, the Landgrave despatched, through the dexterous and pliant Bucer, a letter to Melanchthon and Luther, in which he expressed a wish to obtain their authorisation to take as a second wife *Margaret von der Saale*, maid-of-honour to his sister Elizabeth. He was of an ardent temperament, he said, and of a vigorous constitution, and could not possibly remain alone during his frequent attendance at the diets of the empire and of his own States, where everyone lived for pleasure and enjoyment, while to have his wife and court ladies to accompany him would be troublesome and inconvenient.

Luther and Melanchthon were greatly perplexed. On the one hand, they shrank from the odium that would attach to them should they authorise the Landgrave's adultery; and, on the other, they dreaded, that, in case of refusal, he might carry out his threat, and return to the Catholic Church. But the defection of the Landgrave had more terrors for these pure reformers than the approval of an adulterous union, and they consequently authorised Philip to take a second wife, as they piously expressed it, "*in order to provide for the welfare of his body and soul, and to bring greater glory to God.*"

This instrument, signed by Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, and five theologians from Hesse, went on to say, that to avoid scandal the marriage should be performed privately, in presence of only a few witnesses, and as if under seal of confession.[2]

The marriage ceremony was performed March 3, 1540, at Rothenburg on the Fuld, in presence of Melanchthon, Bucer, and other theologians, by the Hessian preacher, *Denis Melander*, who had special qualifications for the office, having himself taken three wives. This affair for a time disquieted Luther, but he soon recovered his equanimity; "for his great heart," as Bucer writes, "was not easily shaken." Melanchthon, however, was not made of such stern stuff, and the grief and remorse he felt for his part in the transaction brought on a dangerous illness.

Every effort was made to keep the secret of the marriage; but female vanity was not proof against the seductions of notoriety, and

[1] Landgrave Philip of Hesse, being a Supplement to the picture drawn in the Hist. and Polit. Papers of the schism of the sixteenth century (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIV., Vols. XV. and XVI., but, especially, Vol. XVIII., p. 224 sq., "Philip's Bigamy"). *Hassencamp*, Ch. H. of Hesse during the age of the Reformation, Marburg, 1852, Vol. I. *Herzog's* Cyclopædia, Vol. II., pp. 512-537.

[2] Instrumentum copulationis Philippi Landgravii et Margaritæ de Saal—*Bossuet*, Hist. des Variations, T. I., p. 306. (Tr.)

the whole affair shortly leaked out.[1] Luther declared "that the divulgence of the secret admitted of no defence, and that he would therefore either deny outright having authorised the second marriage at all (a course which he might possibly take, since the authorisation was granted for a secret marriage only, which therefore became null and void by being made public); or, should this course fail him, he would come out openly, confess that he had blundered and played the fool, and crave pardon for his fault."

This affair was the occasion of a controversy between Luther and *Henry, Duke of Brunswick*, in the course of which Luther, in a pamphlet directed against the Duke, and entitled "Against the Buffoon," took occasion to show that that gentleman's conduct was not exemplary, and that his relations to his mistress, Eve of Trotta, were not honourable.

The Landgrave, Philip, continued to live a peaceful and quiet life with his two wives, and he had the further gratification of having, after the date of his second marriage, two sons and a daughter born to him by Christina, and six sons by Margaret, the latter of whom were all called Counts of Diez.

§ 318. *Fresh Acts of Violence by Protestants—Renewed Attempts to adjust Religious Difficulties.*

The bishopric of *Naumburg-Zeitz* falling vacant, the Chapter gave its suffrages in favour of *Julius von Pflug*, a man distinguished for his theological learning, his sweet temper, and pacific disposition: but the Elector, *John Frederic, the Magnanimous*, disregarding the rights and ignoring the action of the Chapter, arbitrarily appointed *Nicholas von Amsdorf* to the vacant see (1542), taking the precaution, however, to grant him only the salary of a parish priest, and to put the temporal administration of the diocese into the hands of an official of the electorate. Luther, who never lost an opportunity to cast ridicule upon the institutions of the Catholic Church, sacrilegiously consecrated Amsdorf a bishop after his own fashion, and, referring to the affair in his writings, did so in a tone of cynical irreverence and coarse brutality. "We have," said he, "consecrated a bishop without chrism; nay, more, without butter or lard, or suet, or tar, or grease, or incense, or coals."[2]

The forcible intrusion of this farcical bishop into a Catholic see was immediately followed by another act almost, if not quite, so vio-

[1] Cf. *Seckendorf*, Lib. III.; the original pieces are all printed in full in *Bossuet*, Hist. of the Variations of Protestant churches, Vol. I., Bk. VI., at the end; New York ed. of 1851, pp. 200-218 (Germ. transl. by Meyer, Vol. I., pp. 286-310); in *Ulenberg*, Hist. of the Luth. Reformers, Vol. II., pp. 468-484. *Schmitt*, Essay of a hist. and philos. Exposition, etc., p. 429 sq. Cf. also "The Tomb of Margaret of Saale" (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 751 sq.; Vol. XVIII., p. 224 sq.; Vol. XX., p, 93 sq.

[2] Cf. *Lepsius*, The Nomination and Induction of Nicholas von Amsdorf, Nordhausen, 1835; *A. Jansen*, Julius Pflug, etc., in *Opel's* New Communications of the Thuringian and Saxon Society, Vol X., I. 2. Nordhausen, 1864.

lent and atrocious. *Henry, Duke of Brunswick, whose fidelity to the Catholic Church had always remained constant and ardent,* was engaged in a war against the rebellious subjects of his ducal city of Brunswick, which had joined the League of Schmalkald[1] contrary to his wishes. The city of Goslar had been placed under ban of the empire by sentence of the Imperial Chamber, and Henry was proceeding to carry the sentence into effect when he was attacked by the princes of the Protestant League, his States invaded and seized (1542), Lutheranism introduced into them, and he himself forced to flee the country, and take refuge in Bavaria.

The *bishopric of Hildesheim,*[2] which had been granted by Imperial award to the Dukes Eric and Henry, became the scene of outrages similar to those perpetrated in Brunswick, which in the sequel were followed by consequences equally disastrous.

The conduct of *Herman,* Count of Wied, and (p. 1515) Prince Elector of Cologne, was a fresh source of embarrassment to the Catholic party. He set out by taking up the work of *Catholic* reform, commenced by Gropper, and sanctioned by a Provincial Council, held in 1536, and would have experienced but little difficulty in carrying it out successfully in his diocese had he possessed the mental endowments and moral qualifications indispensable to such a task. But of these he was wholly destitute. Of weak and unstable character, he gradually drifted into liberal habits of thought, accepted the new doctrines in their most radical sense, and ended by introducing Protestantism into his States according to a form drawn up by Bucer and Melanchthon, the former of whom opened a course of lectures on exegetics in the Franciscan Convent of Bonn, the usual summer residence of the Archbishop of Cologne. The Reformers, however, were far from having matters all their own way. They were resolutely and vigorously opposed by the canons of the Metropolitan Chapter of Cologne, who also published a refutation of the new teachings (*antididagma*). The members of the city council took sides with the Chapter, and both bodies were encouraged by the Pope and the emperor to continue to offer a determined resistance to the Reformers. The archbishop, appreciating the danger of his position, professed to yield; but it shortly appeared that his professions were insincere, and intended only to gain time. An appeal against him, drawn up in the name of the States, the Clergy, and the University, was then made to the Pope and the emperor, by whom he was summoned to give an account of his conduct, which failing to do, he was stripped of his possessions and declared

[1] *Lentz,* Hist. of the Introd. of the Evangelical Confession into the duchy of Brunswick, Wolfenbüttel, 1830. *Gietz,* John Bugenhagen the Reformer of Brunswick, Lps., 1830. †*Hildesheim,* Theological Monthly, Oct. and Nov. nros. of 1851.

[2] Cf. "Lutheranism in the city of Hildesheim," from an ancient manuscript (*Hist. and Polit. Papers,* Vols. IX. and X.) *Reifenberg,* Hist. Societatis Jesu ad Rhen. infer., T. 1., p. 251 sq. *Lüntzel,* The Adoption of the Evangelical Confession by the City of Hildesheim, Hildesheim, 1842. Cf. also *Schlegel,* Ecclesiastical and Reformatory History of North Germany, especially of the Hanoverian States, Hanover, 1828, 1829, 2 vols. *Baring,* Hist. of the Reformation of the City of Hanover, Hanover, 1842.

excommunicate.[1] He then made application to be admitted into the League of Schmalkald, and had the mortification of having his request refused; he invoked the intervention of the Protestant princes, and received in reply fair promises, which were never made good; and having thus experienced disappointment after disappointment, he was finally forced to content himself with the single county of Neuwied († 1552).

But on the other hand, in addition to the countries of North Germany already mentioned, the cities of *Magdeburg*, *Halberstadt*, *Halle*, *Meissen*, and others, were also severed from the Church;[2] and efforts were made to introduce Protestantism into the States of the Most Catholic, Dukes of *Bavaria*, into those of King *Ferdinand*, into the *Tyrol*,[3] and elsewhere. Everywhere the prospect of becoming hereditary princes was held out to Catholic bishops as a bribe to induce them to embrace Protestantism.[4]

Finally, the Protestant princes, by putting a dishonest interpretation upon the acts of the Diet of Spire (1542), where the chief question related to the raising of subsidies to be employed against the Turks (a matter which gave them very little concern), sought to justify their deeds of violence against Brunswick and Naumburg, and to find a pretext for dismissing all the suits at law pending in the Imperial Chamber. Consistently with their former policy, they refused to take any part in the General Council which had lately been convoked to meet at *Trent*.

Still, the emperor, desirous of having peace, and willing to pay almost any price to secure it, made concessions so extensive to the Protestants at the late Diet of Spire (1544), that the Catholics, not without reason, charged him with having outstepped the bounds of his power, and Pope Paul III., in a letter, dated August 24, 1544, expressed his sorrow at the emperor's action, and his serious apprehension as to its consequences. Charles having, with the co-operation of the Protestants of his empire, from whom he had been fortunate enough to obtain a declaration of war against France, compelled his haughty adversary, Francis I., to sign the *Peace of Crespy* (September 18, 1544), set to work to dissipate the doubts which had been cast

[1] †*Deckers*, Herman von Wied, Archbishop and Elector of Cologne, Cologne, 1840. *Meuser*, s. v. Herman von Wied in the Third Vol. of *Aschbach's* Eccl. Cyclopæd. †*Pacca*, Cardinal, "Memorie Storiche," Roma, 1832, in which is a report of the Great Services rendered to the Cath. Church during the sixteenth century, by the Clergy, University, and Municipality of Cologne (Transl. from the Ital. into Germ., Augsburg, 1840. *Ennen*, Hist. of the Reformation in the Territory of the Archdiocese of Cologne, Neuss, 1849. The *same* treats this subject exhaustively in his "Hist. of the City of Cologne."

[2] Introd. of the Reformation into the Archdiocese of Magdeburg (*Fiedler*, Pastoral Gazette of Torgau, 4th year, 1842, Jan., Feb., March, and May). *Franke*, Hist. of the Reformation in the City of Halle, Halle, 1841. *Apfelstedt*, Introd. of the Lutheran Reform into the District of Schwarzburg, Sondershausen, 1841 (For the Jubilee of 1841). *Fraastadt*, The Introd. of the Reform into the Bishopric of Merseburg, Lps., 1844.

[3] Reformatory Intrigues in *Bavaria*, in the middle of the sixteenth century (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. IX., pp. 14-29). Schism of *Tyrol* (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., pp. 577-609). †*Beda Weber*, Tyrol and the Reformation, Innsbruck, 1841.

[4] *Hase*, Ch. H., Engl. trans., N. Y., 1873, p. 392. (Tr.)

upon his conduct, and to place himself in his true character before the world. He in consequence urged that a General Council should be convoked to assemble, March 15, 1545.

At a late Diet held at *Worms* (March, 1545), the Protestants again expressed their determination to take no part in *the proposed Council of Trent*, because it had been convoked by the Pope. In giving expression to their sentiments on this occasion, they employed language unusually coarse and violent even for that age. They were also at pains to scatter throughout the Catholic States copies of Luther's work entitled, "*The Papacy an Institution of the Devil*," preceded by an indecent and brutal frontispiece,[1] and accompanied by a tract, written by *Melanchthon*,[2] in which the author did his best to malign and insult Catholics. Notwithstanding these acts of determined hostility, the emperor still clung to the vain hope of settling the religious difficulties by conference, and he accordingly summoned one to be held at *Ratisbon*, January 27, 1546. It seems strange that he should not have foreseen that this conference, apart from the fact that the assembling of such a body for such a purpose after the Council of Trent had already been opened, was a practical ignoring of the authority of the latter, could accomplish no possible good in the existing temper of the Protestant mind.[3]

Their action, however, left the emperor free to assume a more aggressive attitude, which, having concluded an armistice with the Turks, he was now in a position to do. He began to make preparations for war, and openly declared to the Protestant princes, who questioned him on the subject, that while no token of his good-will should be withheld from the loyal States of his empire, every resource of his imperial power should be put forth to reduce those in rebellion to subjection. He also issued a proclamation to the whole empire,

[1] *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 1278 sq.; also printed separately, with annotations by Abbot *Prechtl*, in his "Fragments in Refutation of the Wisdom of Dr. Martin Luther," intended as contribution to the Jubilee of the Lutheran Reformation, 3rd ed., Sulzbach, 1818.

[2] Melanchthon wrote by order of the Prince-Elector: "Causæ, quare et amplexati sint et retinendam ducant doctrinam . . . confessionis Aug. . . . et quare iniquis judicibus collectis in synodo Trident., ut vocant, non sit adsentiendum." Vit., 1546. (Opp. ed. Vit. T. IV., p. 772.) The following are the chief points brought out by Melanchthon: 1. One should obey God rather than man; 2. The Pope has no authority to convoke a Council; 3. The Bible, and the Bible only, can be used in determining what is Christian faith; 4. The warrant for the truth of Protestant teaching is to be found in the fact that it is held by thousands; 5. Inasmuch as laymen are excluded from the Council of Trent, it cannot be said to be a general council; 6. The place of assembling is itself a circumstance calculated to excite distrust; 7. Nothing good can be expected from the bishops assembled there, for they know as little of the teaching of Christ as the asses upon which they ride. It will only be necessary to *place beside this ribald and insulting language the loving invitations repeatedly addressed to the Protestants by the Council and the Popes*, imploring them to unite in securing harmony to the Christian world, to see the wide difference between the spirit by which each party was animated Sess. XIII., De Reformatione, c. 8: Sess. XV.; Sess. XVIII.

[3] Actor. colloquii Ratisbonen. ultimi verissima relatio, Ingolstadii, 1546, 4to (printed by order of the emperor). Report of *G. Major*, Wittenberg, 1546, 4to (*Hortleder*, Pt. I., Bk. 1, ch. 40); by *Bucer*, ibid., ch. 41, and in *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 1529. See *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 742 sq.

stating that the war in which he was about to engage was not one of religion, and that his sole purpose in undertaking it was to compel the submission of those who, under cover of religion, had disturbed the public peace, and committed numerous and flagrant acts of violence. He declared the Landgrave of Hesse and the Elector of Saxony, both of whom were marching towards the Danube at the head of numerous armies, under ban of the empire.

§ 319. *Death of Luther—His Public Character.*

Döllinger, The Reformation, Vol. I., p. 278 sq.; Vol. III., pp. 251-253. *Von Görres*, Luther's Work, and Luther's Works (Catholic of 1827). (Doller) Luther's Catholic Monument, Frankfort, 1817. The Luther Monument of Worms, etc., see Vol. II., p. 979, note 2.

The trials and contradictions which came to Luther from every quarter had early soured his temper, and made him discontented and morose. Himself dissatisfied, according to his own avowal, with his religious system,[1] he had the further mortification of knowing that it had a still more uncertain hold upon the minds of his former adherents. Even at Wittenberg, the scene of his own zealous and extraordinary labours, no moral improvement was visible among the inhabitants. In a sermon, preached as early as 1532, he had made this candid confession: "Since we have commenced to preach our doctrine (the *pure* doctrine of the Gospel), the world has grown daily worse, more impious, and more shameless. Men are now beset by legions of devils, and, while enjoying the full light of the Gospel, are more avaricious, more impure, and repulsive, than of old, under the Papacy. Peasants, burghers, and nobles—men of all degrees, the highest as well as the lowest—are all alike slaves to avarice, drunkenness, gluttony, and impurity, and given over to shameful excesses and abominable passions."[2] Unable longer to witness patiently the steadily increasing wantonness and libertinism of the inhabitants of Wittenberg, he quitted the city in angry disgust, resolved never again to enter it. "Let us go out from this Sodom," he wrote to

[1] "Alas!" he cried out on one occasion, "there was a time when I could believe anything on the authority of the Pope and the monks; but now my reason rejects even what comes to me on the authority of Christ, who cannot possibly lead me astray." On another occasion, at the close of the singing of grace before meals, he remarked: "Should one say that that singing is really good, he would be about as near the truth as if I should say that I believe the teachings of theology to be true." M. Anthony Musa, pastor of Rochlitz, once remarked to Luther with candid frankness that he *could* not himself believe what he preached to others, to which the latter replied: "Praised be God that there be others no better off than myself. I had fancied myself the only person in such a frame of mind." Musa continued during his whole life to take comfort from these consoling words of his master (Table-Talk). There is something strikingly characteristic in the devices employed by Luther *to stifle the voice of conscience*, and the inspirations of the Holy Ghost speaking through it. He professed to regard these salutary warnings as *so many devices of the devil*, and struggled against them accordingly. "The devil," he said, "has often upbraided me, and entered into controversy concerning the affair I have in hand; but," he complacently continues, "I had rather the temple should be destroyed than that Christ should remain hidden and unknown." Cf. *Menzel*, Vol. II., pp. 427-429.

[2] Conf. *Döllinger*, L. c., Vol. I., p. 289 sq., 297 sq., 306 sq., and p. 167 sq.

his wife in July, 1545. "I had rather," he continues, "go about the world as a stranger, and eat the bread of a beggar, than pass the few remaining miserable days of my life as a martyr in Wittenberg, to the detriment of my hard but precious labour." He, however, returned again to that city, but only at the urgent solicitation of the university and the elector.

While the principal points of Luther's teaching were being discussed at Ratisbon, he himself, though ill in health, made a journey to *Eisleben*, at the request of the Elector of Saxony, for the purpose of arbitrating between the Counts George and Albert of Mansfeld, who were disputing about the boundaries of certain mining districts. But his efforts to adjust matters were not more successful than those of the lawyers had been, out of whose hands he had taken the litigation on his arrival.[1]

Ascending the pulpit of St. Andrew's Church, in Eisleben, for the last time, Luther once more called down the vengeance of heaven upon the Jews, a race of people whom he had so unjustly and virulently assailed in his earlier writings, that his followers after his death were confused at the very mention of his malignant denunciations. In his first pamphlet against them, he called upon Christians to take the Bible from them, to burn their books and synagogues with pitch and brimstone, and to forbid their worship[2] under penalty of death; and in his second, entitled "*Of Shem Hamphoras*," he describes them at the very outset as "young devils doomed to hell," who should be driven out of the country.

Luther, after drinking and feasting, and jesting with his friends on the death of Pope Paul III. and the downfall of the Papacy, was taken suddenly ill on February 17, 1546, and died on the night of the following day. Thus suddenly and prematurely was Luther stricken down in the town where he had been born and baptized, after he had passed his life and exerted his powerful influence in setting people against people, sundering social bonds, and inflicting a severe, though not as he fancied, *fatal wound* upon the Church of his fathers. "But this wound," as *Mœhler* well observes, "served also for the discharge of impurities which wicked men had introduced into the body of the Church—a thought full of comfort where there are so many painful reflections."

Luther closed[3] his career of a Reformer as he had opened it,

[1] Luther's Letters, apud *De Wette*, Vol. V., p. 753.

[2] Cf. *De Wette*, Vol. V., p. 610. When, on one occasion, in 1546, Luther was journeying through the territory of the Counts of Mansfeld, on entering a village inhabited by Jews, a cold, frosty wind whistled about his ears and almost froze him, he insisted that the Jews had malignantly evoked the chilling breezes, and accordingly wrote to his wife, in a letter dated February 1, 1546: "When I shall have finished my chief business, I shall devote my energies to the expulsion of the Jews. Count Albert hates them heartily, and has declared them outlaws, but so far no one has done them harm. Should it be God's will, *I shall mount the pulpit*, and, with Count Albert, declare them beyond the pale of the law."

[3] The following are among the most significant sentiments of Luther: "Nos hic persuasi sumus ad papatum decipiendum *omnia* licere." And again: "Pestis eram vivus,

breathing hostility against the Pope, and uttering drivelling contradictions like the following: "*The Pope is the most holy and the most devilish of fathers.*" His teachings, like his life, are full of inconsistencies.[1] Shortly before his death, he declared that the Scriptures contained mysteries and unfathomable depths, in the presence of which one must humbly bow his head.[2]

But however numerous and glaring may have been the inconsistencies of Luther's life and teachings, he was always at one with himself in insolent pride and self-sufficiency, and in the *testament* containing his last will showed his usual impatience and contempt of all the accepted forms of human right and law.[3]

Judging Luther by the wonderful activity and tumultuous excitement of his life, he is one of the most remarkable men the world has ever produced; but regarding him in his character as a *reformer* of the Church, he made the most disastrous failure of any person who ever attempted that difficult task, for the reason that he was totally destitute of the necessary virtues of charity and humility. Arrogantly rejecting the authority of the Church, he soon learned that he had acted precipitately and unwisely, and was forced to shelter himself behind it to successfully defend himself against his adversaries. That he possessed courage is undeniable; but it is equally true that his courage frequently degenerated into foolish *bravado*. His *activity* was ceaseless and untiring, and his *eloquence* popular and captivating, his mind quick, his imagination brilliant, his character unselfish, and his temper profoundly religious. This overmastering religious sentiment, so characteristic of his system, contrasts strangely with the habitual blasphemy and sarcasm of his language. Hence Erasmus said that he was a compound of two personalities. "At times," says the scholar of Rotterdam, "he writes like an apostle, and again he

moriens ero mors tua, papa!" The latter is to be found in a letter written after his departure from Schmalkald (*De Wette*, Luther's Letters, Vol. V., p. 57), and again repeated, immediately before his death, in his pamphlet, entitled, "*The Papacy an Institution of the Devil.*" His partisans continued long afterwards to approve them by making them serve as legends for *jubilee medals*. Cfr. *Pasig*, The Writings published on the Occasion of Luther's Centenary Jubilees, Lps., 1846.

[1] Hence *Cochlæus* wrote: "Lutherus septiceps ubique sibi suisque scriptis contrarius," Paris, 1564. Cf. *Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 336; Vol. XI., p. 413.

[2] It is a great and difficult thing to understand the Scriptures. Five years' hard labour are required to understand either the Georgics or Bucolics of Virgil; an experience of twenty years to be master of the epistles of Cicero; and one hundred years' study of the prophets Elias, Eliseus, of St. John the Baptist, Christ and the Apostles, to get a mere insight into the Scriptures.

"Hanc tu ne divinam Æneida tenta,
Sed vestigia pronus adora."

Of a truth it may be said, poor human nature!

[3] "Notus sum," it is said there, "in cœlo, in terra et inferno, et auctoritatem ad hoc sufficientem habeo, ut mihi soli credatur, quum Deus mihi homini licet damnabilii et miserabili peccatori ex paterna misericordia Evangelium filii sui crediderit dederitque, ut in eo verax et fidelis fuerim, ita ut multi in mundo illud per me acceperint, et me pro doctore veritatis agnoverint, spreto banno papæ, Cæsaris, regum, principum et sacerdotum, imo omnium dæmonum odio. Quidni igitur ad depositionem hanc in re exigua sufficiat, si adsit manus meæ testimonium et dici possit, hæc scripsit, D. Mart. Luther, notarius Dei et testis Evangelii ejus?" (*Seckend.*, lib. III., p. 651).

talks like a fool. His jests are so coarse, and his thrusts so reckless, that he seems utterly forgetful of the figure he is cutting, or the spectacle he is presenting to the world." When I pray (i. e., say the Our Father), said Luther on one occasion, I can't help cursing the whole time.[1] While declaiming against the use of arms in vindicating the rights of religion, he put forth principles and employed language that might have done honour to a Jacobin of the eighteenth century. Apparently *frank* and honest in his advocacy of an unlimited freedom in interpreting the Holy Scriptures, he refused to his adversaries the right which he vauntingly arrogated to himself; and, while proclaiming the glorious prerogatives of free inquiry, conducted himself towards his most devoted adherents and most intimate friends, Melanchthon among the rest, as a tyrant and a despot. So imperious was he in the assertion of his magisterial authority, and so exacting in its exercise, that Melanchthon confesses that, in his own case, it amounted to a degrading slavery (*Tuli servitutem pœne deformem*).

When it is further borne in mind that Luther was both a glutton and a drunkard, having so little regard for ordinary proprieties that he brutally wrote to his wife, in a letter dated July 2, 1540, "*I am feeding like a Bohemian and swilling like a German, thanks be to God;*"[2] that in speaking of marriage, the most sacred of social institutions, he gave utterance to thoughts so indecent in language, so coarse and revolting, that one seeks in vain to find an apology for him in the lax morals of that lax age ;[3] and that he employed this language not alone at *table*, but in his published writings and public addresses, one feels bound, apart from any consideration of the perversity of his principles or the falsity of his teachings, to say that he is hardly such a person as would be singled out as having received a vocation to inaugurate and carry out a moral reform. It has always been characteristic of those who have had any success in carrying out reforms in the Church, that they began their work by first reforming themselves, and it is hardly necessary to remark that this was not Luther's method. To discover the notes of a reformer in the ungovernable transports, the riotous proceedings, the angry conflicts, and the intemperate controversies which made up the life of Luther, presupposes a partiality amounting to blindness.

"It must be evident," says Erasmus, "to the most feeble intellect, that one who raised so great a storm in the world, who always found

[1] A number of these Our Fathers, embellished with profane oaths, may be seen in *Weislinger*, L. c., preface, p. CCCCVIII. sq.

[2] *Burckhardt*, Correspondence of Dr. M. Luther, Leipsig, 1866, p. 357.

[3] Hence the strong expostulations addressed to him by his friends, given by *De Wette*, Vol. II., p. 49; Vol. IV., pp. 271, 276. Count *Hoyer of Mansfeld* wrote, in 1522, as follows to Count Ulrich of Helfenstein: "I have been all along, as I was at Worms, a good Lutheran; but I have learned that Luther is a blackguard, and as good a drunkard as there is in Mansfeld, delighting to be in the company of beautiful women and to play upon his flute. His conduct is unbecoming, and he seems irretrievably fallen." Cf. Luther's Correspondence, in *Burkhardt*, in the Supplement to the Augsburg Universal Gazette of January 18, 1867.

pleasure in using language either indecent or caustic, could not have been called of God. His arrogance, to which no parallel can be found, was scarcely distinguishable from madness; *and his buffoonery was such that it could not be supposed possible in one doing the work of God.*"[1]

His character is accurately portrayed in the following brief sketch from the pen of *Pallavicini*. "The products of his prolific genius," says the distinguished historian of the Council of Trent, "were extravagant and abnormal, rather than choice and correct—resembling more some gigantic offspring of immature birth, than the shapely babe brought forth after the lapse of nature's appointed time. His intellect was vigorous and robust; but its strength was expended in pulling down, not in building up. Gifted with a tenacious memory, he had acquired a vast deal of erudition, which he poured forth, as the occasion demanded, in impetuous torrents, resembling a thunder-storm in its angry and destructive fury, rather than the refreshing rains of summer, that brighten and gladden the face of nature. He was an eloquent speaker and writer; but his eloquence was more like the rush of the whirlwind, blinding the eyes with a cloud of dust, than the placid flow of a peaceful fountain, delighting them with light and colour. His language was such that, throughout the whole of his works, not a single sentence can be found wholly free from a certain coarseness and vulgarity. Courageous to temerity in prosperous, he was cowardly to abjectness in adverse fortune. Professing his readiness to remain silent if his adversaries would do the same, he clearly showed that he was actuated, not by a motive of zeal for God's glory, but by feelings of jealousy and self-love. Princes were among his followers; but they became such not from any desire of forwarding his cause, but in the hope of enriching themselves with the property of the Church. The harm he did to the Church was indeed great; but, while bringing incomparable disaster upon others, brought no advantage to himself. His name will be memorable in history for all time, but as a name of infamy and dishonour. Now that the rotten branches have been lopped from the vine of the Church, the sound and living ones will thrive and flourish all the better for their absence."

Ancillon, an acute observer and faithful delineator of human character, has also given us a picture of Luther,[2] but its outlines are not more flattering or less repulsive than those of Pallavicini.

But in spite of these adverse criticisms, the followers of Luther have bestowed upon the memory of their founder an honour which the Church reserves for her greatest saints, and for doing which Catholics have been reproached with committing a scandalous impiety.[3]

[1] *Erasmus*, Hyperaspistes, Diatribe adv. servum arbit. Lutheri.

[2] *Ancillon* expresses his judgment of the heresiarch in the following words: "His acts were the result of passion, rather than the outgrowth of fixed principles; and if, on the one hand, his character was not soiled by degrading vice, on the other, it was not ennobled by distinguished virtue. On the whole, admitting that he was gifted with genius, it cannot be denied that *he was destitute of moral qualities of a high order.*" Cf. also *Raumer*, Hist. of Europe from the Close of the Fifteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 524 sq.

[3] In proof of this statement, we refer the reader to the following work, written on occasion of the Jubilee of the Eighteenth Century: "The Gold and Silver Memorial of the

§ 320. *The Schmalkaldic War—Religious Peace of Augsburg* (1555)—*Resignation and Death of Charles V.*

Hortleder, Vol. II., Bk. III., p. 618 sq. Note-book of Emperor Charles V., German, by *Warnkoenig*, Lps. 1862. *Camerarii*, Comm, belli Smalc. graece script. (Freher, T. III., p. 557). Hist. of the Smalkaldic War, by *Hahn*, Lps., 1837; by *Jahn*, Lps., 1857. *Pallavicini*, lib. VIII., c. 1. *A. Menzel*, Vol. II., pp. 451-472; Vol. III., pp. 1-480. *Riffel*, Vol. II., pp. 733-760.

The chiefs of the Protestant League had been placed under ban of the empire in an edict published by the emperor, July 20, 1546, a course which received fresh significance and increased importance from a bull published by Pope Paul III., proclaiming a crusade, and calling upon the Church to contribute towards carrying it on.[1] When, however, war was finally declared, the Protestant princes were found fully prepared for the conflict. The League of Schmalkald had already been in existence for fifteen years, and the army of the Lutheran princes was in every way vastly superior to that of the emperor, from the fact that some Catholic princes, jealous of his power, refused to range themselves under his standard. Charles was anxious, in case of success, to dictate his own terms of peace, and in consequence delayed calling them to his aid until he could no longer dispense with their assistance without peril to himself.

On the other hand, although *Schertlein* of Burtenbach enjoyed at the time the reputation of being an able commander,[2] it is nevertheless true that his reputation was undeserved, and that there was no man possessed of real military talent on the Protestant side. Again, *Maurice of Saxony*,[3] a Protestant, who had succeeded to Henry, his father, in the government of the Duchy of Saxony, in 1541, passed over to the Catholic party. Apart from the fact that his father's attachment to the Protestant League had been greatly weakened by the influence of the former counsellors of Duke George, Maurice, who was a nephew of the latter prince, and had been brought up at his court, was repelled by the manners and detested the character of the elector, John Frederic. Still, having married the daughter of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, he could neither fail to perceive, nor was he wholly insensible to, the advantages which he might reap by embracing Protestantism. The

Dear Master in God, Dr. M. Luther, in which a detailed account is given of his death, his family, and his relics, based upon above two hundred very curious medals and engravings, with pertinent remarks by Christian Junker, Historiographer to the Illustrious Prince of Saxony-Henneberg," Frankfort and Leipsig, 1706, p. 562. This is just what he foretold his followers would do once he had passed away. In his Table-Talk, he says: "Adorabunt stercora nostra et pro balsamo habebunt."

[1] Cf. *Raynald.*, Ad. an. 1546, nro. 94. The Pope promised an Indulgence to the Crusaders; the Protestants, in turn, had public prayers offered up against the Pope and the Emperor, as enemies of the word of God. *Walch*, T. XVII., p. 1832 sq.

[2] Sebast. Schertlein of Burtenbach and his Letters to the Diet of Augsburg, published by *Th. Herberger*, Augsburg, 1852.

[3] *Von Langenn*, Maurice, Elector of Saxony, and his Age, Lps. 1841, 2 vols. *Cornelius*, Illustration of the Policy of Maurice, Elector of Saxony ('*Munich*, Annuary of History, year 1866).

Emperor Charles, who had already had experience of Maurice's valour and capacity during his campaign against France, desirous to again secure his services as an ally, induced him to break off his connection with the League of Schmalkald, on the plea that he might now conscientiously do so since the Protestants had signified their intention not to attend the Œcumenical Council. Maurice accordingly accepted the emperor's terms, entered into a compact with him (June 19, 1546), and further pledged himself to give such *obedience* to the decrees of the Œcumenical Council *as they should receive from the other Princes of the empire.* He then proceeded to march an army into the States of the Elector of Saxony, of which he took forcible possession under pretence of preventing them from falling into the hands of Ferdinand, King of the Romans. When the news of this bold act reached the elector, who was encamped with the allied army on the borders of Suabia and Bavaria, he at once set out for Saxony. After the disbandment of the Protestant army, towards the close of autumn, city after city returned to their allegiance; and, by the opening of the following spring, the whole of Southern Germany had been reduced to submission without the shedding of a drop of blood. The Elector of Saxony, who had in the meantime regained possession of his States, while encamped in the forest of Lochau, *near Mühlberg*, was surprised by the imperial forces, suffered the total destruction of his army, and was himself made prisoner (April 24, 1547). Shortly after, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, surrendered at discretion; but, owing to pledges of security given by his son-in-law, Maurice, who had succeeded to the Electorate of Saxony, thus crippling the power of the Protestants, he was permitted the enjoyment of a restricted freedom. The emperor, having secured these splendid triumphs, not only without the concurrence of a single Catholic prince, but with the aid of a Protestant one, had no intention of employing the advantages they gave him either to extend his own dominion, or to compel Protestants by force to enter the Church. The latter end he hoped to secure by some amicable arrangement. To some over-zealous advisers, who referred to Cæsar's habit of following up a victory by the total destruction of the enemy, the emperor replied: "The Ancients were guided by the principles of *honour only*; we Christians by the principles *both of honour and of conscience.*"

Now that Charles had the power, the interests of the Catholic Church and the requirements of justice demanded that he should restore Julius von Pflug to the See of Naumburg, whence he had been driven away in defiance of all law and right; and to execute the sentence of deposition passed upon Herman, Archbishop of Cologne; and having done so, he opened the Diet of Augsburg (September 1, 1547), in the hope of finally bringing about the union so long desired and so frequently attempted, but which he despaired of effecting through a council which the Protestants had rejected in advance, alleging as an additional excuse for their action that it had been transferred from Trent to Bologna.

By the *famous "Interim" of Augsburg*[1]—the joint production of *Julius von Pflug*, Bishop of Naumburg; *Michael Helding*, coadjutor of Mentz; and the wily and subtle *John Agricola*, preacher to the Elector of Brandenburg—Protestants were permitted to receive the Holy Eucharist under both kinds; the Protestant clergy already married to retain their wives; and a tacit approval given to the retention of property already taken from the Church. This instrument was, from beginning to end, a masterpiece of duplicity, and as such satisfied no party. The Catholics of Germany, the Protestants, and the Court of Rome, each took exception to it. Rome complained that the emperor had acted arbitrarily in thus summarily disposing of purely religious questions; and the Lutherans angrily protested against the proceeding as a "fornication with the whore of Babylon," and, having the invectives of Luther fresher in their memory than his pious exhortations, had recourse to every manner of expression to signify their abhorrence of what they styled a work of the devil, a revival of Papistry, and a new scheme to undermine the pure faith of Protestants (*das Interim hat den Schalk hinter ihm*). *Magdeburg* signified its opposition in a formal protest; and Maurice, the new Elector of Saxony, unwilling to give the *Interim* an unconditional approval, consulted with a number of Protestant theologians, headed by Melanchthon, as to how far he might accept its provisions with a safe conscience. In reply they drew up what is known as the *Leipsig Interim* (1548), in which they stated that questions of ritual and ceremony, and others of minor importance, which they designated by the generic word *adiaphora*, might be wholly overlooked; and even in points of a strictly doctrinal character, they expressed themselves favourable to concession and compromise. They said, "that, while, on the one hand, man is *justified* solely by the merits of Jesus Christ; on the other, God does not direct his conduct as one might control the movements of a machine. The works ordained of God," they added, "are *good* and *necessary* to salvation, and so are also the three theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity." Confirmation and Extreme Unction, which had but lately been rejected with intemperate haste, they now admitted to be true Sacraments; and they further agreed that *Mass* should be celebrated according to the ancient rite, only stipulating that German canticles should be sung while the solemn act of worship was in progress. It was evident from these concessions that the spirit of Luther was no more; and the German theologians of the Lutheran party, *changing their conduct to suit the changed circumstances in which they found themselves*, were now as docile to imperial authority as they had formerly been servile to the insolent demands of Philip of Hesse.

[1] It was published by the emperor, May 15, 1548. He also submitted on this occasion a plan of *disciplinary reform* to the bishops present. Formula Reformationis a Carolo V. in Comitiis Augustan., 1548, Statibus ecclesiast. oblata cum commentatione *Ant. Dürr*, Mogunt., 1782. Conf. *J. E. Bieck*, The Triple Interim, Lps., 1721. *J. A. Schmidt*, Historia interimistica, Helmst., 1730.

In the meantime, however, such Lutheran preachers as professed to be faithful followers of their master, made a determined opposition to the "*Interim*," and began a vigorous assault upon its *adiaphoristic* clauses. The *Anti-adiaphorists*, as they were called, were headed by *Flacius Illyricus*, who being an ardent disciple of Luther's, and possessing somewhat of his courage and energy, repaired to *Magdeburg*, whose bold citizens were as defiant of imperial power as they were contemptuous of papal authority. But, in spite of this spirited opposition, the *Interim* was gradually accepted by several Protestant countries and cities—a fact which encouraged the emperor at the *Diet of Augsburg*, in 1550, to make a final effort to have the Protestants attend the sessions of the *Council of Trent*, again opened by Pope *Julius III.* They, however, once more urged their former claims, demanding that their theologians should be entitled to vote upon all questions; that all former acts and decrees should be declared null; and that the Pope should resign the position of presiding officer. Still, notwithstanding their demands, after a short delay, deputies from Brandenburg, Würtemberg, and Saxony began to appear at Trent; and even the Wittenberg theologians, headed by Melanchthon, were already on their way to the Council, when Maurice of Saxony, having secured all the advantages he hoped to obtain by an alliance with the Catholic party, and regardless of the obligations by which he was bound, proceeded *to betray both the emperor and his country.* Having received a commission to carry into effect the ban of the empire passed upon Magdeburg, he was in a position to assemble a large body of troops in Germany without exciting suspicion, or revealing his ulterior purposes. Besides uniting to himself, as confederates in his plot, John Albert, Duke of Mecklenburg; Albert, Margrave of Brandenburg; and William, Landgrave of Hesse, eldest son of Philip of Hesse, he entered into a secret treaty (Oct. 5, 1551) with *Henry II., King of France*, who, as was pretended, coming into Germany as the saviour of the country, seized the cities of *Metz*, *Toul*, and *Verdun*.[1] Maurice also held out to Henry the prospect of securing the imperial crown.[2] Everything being in readiness for action, Maurice, advancing through Thuringia, seized the city of Augsburg, and suddenly made his appearance before Innspruck, whence the emperor, who lay sick

[1] *Scherer*, The Robbery of the Three Bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun (*Raumer* Manual of Hist., New Series, 3rd year); *Cornelius*, L. c. (p. 134, n. 3), says that the severe sentence pronounced upon *Maurice* and his confederates was too long delayed. *Buchholz* Ferdinand I., Vol. VI., p. 477; Vol. VII., p. 23 sq.; *A. Menzel*, Vol. III., p. 411. The following is an extract from the treaty: "Should God favour our cause, we shall do whatever lies in our power to aid him (the King of France) to recover the hereditary provinces of which he has been despoiled (viz., Franche-Comté, Flanders, and Artois). When the election for the Imperial crown takes place, we further pledge ourselves to act in such manner as will be pleasing to his Majesty, and to vote for no one who is not his friend, or who will not give security to maintain amicable relations with him, and be in every respect a good neighbour. Should the king himself be pleased to accept the Crown, we shall gratify his wishes in this regard, and give him the preference before any other."

[2] The treaty is given by *Lünig*, Archives of the Empire, Part. Spéc. et Recueil des Traités de Paix, T. II., p. 258.

of a severe attack of the gout, was hastily conveyed on a litter, through the passes of the mountains, to Villach, in Carinthia. While Maurice was thus making himself master of Innspruck, the King of the French was carrying out his part of the programme by actively prosecuting the war in Lorraine.

Charles V., now destitute of the material resources necessary to carry on a successful campaign against the combined armies of the French king and the German princes, and despairing of putting an end to the obstinate conflict by his personal endeavours, resolved to re-establish, if possible, his waning power by peaceful negotiations. To this end, he commissioned his brother Ferdinand to conclude the *Treaty of Passau* (July 30, 1552),[1] which provided that Philip of Hesse should be set at liberty,[2] and gave pledges for the speedy settlement of all religious and political differences by a Diet, to be summoned at an early day. It further provided that neither the emperor nor the Protestant princes should put any restraint upon freedom of conscience, and that all questions arising in the interval between the two parties should be referred for settlement to an Imperial Commission, composed of an equal number of Catholics and Protestants. In consequence of the war then being carried on by the empire against France for the recovery of the three bishoprics of Lorraine of which the French had taken possession, the Diet did not convene until February 5, 1555. After some discussion, both parties agreed that, *in the existing circumstances*, it was impossible to adjust the religious differences, either by mutual conference or by the action of a general council; and that, though reluctantly putting them aside for the present, they conceived it to be their imperative duty to give their whole attention to the restoration of peace and order in the empire. After a lengthy discussion, the instrument, known as the *Religious Peace of Augsburg*,[3] was accepted as satisfactory to both parties, and it was further agreed that its provisions should have permanent force, irrespective of what might be the ultimate solution of the religious question.

The Religious Peace guaranteed freedom of worship alike to Catholics and to those professing the faith of the Augsburg Confession; but since by the recently-introduced *territorial system*, which replaced the more ancient one by episcopates, princes had the execution of this article entirely in their own hands, a precautionary clause was added, providing that anyone believing his conscience to be outraged in his own State, should be free to pass to another where his religious con-

[1] Archives of German Diets, Pars. gener., p. 131 sq.; *Hortleder*, Pt. II., Bk. V., ch. 14; *Lehmann*, De Pace religionis acta publica et originalia, i. e., Acts and Protocols of the Peace of Religion, Frankfort (1631, 4to), 1707, Supplem., 1709.

[2] The elector had through the emperor regained his freedom some time before.

[3] Archives of the German Empire, Pars. general., p. 131 sq. Pacis compositio inter Principes et Ordines Rom. imperii Catholicos et Protestantes in comitiis Augustanis a. 1555, edita et illustrata a jurisconsulto Catholico, Dilling., 1629. This document in German, and accompanied with many illustrations, was published at Frankfort, 1629, 4to. Conf. *Lehmann*, and see note preceding; also, *Riffel*, Vol. II., pp. 751-760.

victions and feelings would be respected. It was further provided, that such ecclesiastical estates as had been seized by Protestants during, or previously to, the year 1555, should remain permanently in their possession. But the question which presented the greatest difficulty to a settlement was that known as the *Ecclesiastical Reservation* (*Reservatum ecclesiasticum*), according to which the functionaries and officers of all ecclesiastical estates, which from that time forth might go over to Protestantism, should be deposed and deprived of their dignities, and Catholics chosen to fill their places. Albert of Brandenburg, Herman of Cologne, and many more apostate bishops were quoted as instances to show that the precaution was not only wise, but necessary. This article, which gave occasion to the sanguinary conflicts that followed, was carried through the Diet, by the efforts of Ferdinand, in the face of a most determined opposition; and its adversaries, failing to secure its defeat, insisted on having their protest against it inserted in the treaty of peace.

Charles V., taught by experience that his hopes of uniting the two religious parties, for the realization of which he had laboured so long and so earnestly, were illusory, and that to pursue them further would be useless, resolved to withdraw from public affairs, and to give the remainder of his days to God. He is said to have been influenced in making this decision by the words of an old army captain, who remarked to him on a certain occasion that "one should lay aside the active duties of this life in time to give some attention before dying to the affairs of the next," and accordingly, having assembled the States of the Low Countries at Brussels, October 25, 1556, he formally resigned the imperial crown. After reading the act of abdication, Charles, rising from his seat and leaning upon the arm of the Prince of Orange, made an address to those about him, in which he recounted with dignity and pardonable pride, the chief events of his reign, closing with an appeal to his successor, full of parental tenderness and solicitude, urging him to live virtuously, to govern wisely, to respect the rights of his subjects, and to preserve inviolate the faith of the Catholic Church.[1] "I have," said he, "either in a hostile or pacific manner, visited Germany nine times, Spain six times, France four times, Italy seven times, the Low Countries ten times, England twice, and Africa as often. I have made one voyage upon the North Sea, and eight upon the Mediterranean. I have waged many wars, but have always undertaken them more from necessity than inclination. But I have experienced less difficulty in bearing up under these labours and conflicts than I do now in taking leave of you. Still, it must be done; for I feel myself unequal to the task of protecting my subjects, and securing to them that happiness which it is my wish they should enjoy. I had long since made up my mind to resign the crown; but rebellion at home, the French war abroad, and the desire of maintaining inviolate the frontiers of the empire, then

[1] *Robertson*, Hist. of the Reign of Charles V., New York, 1833, pp. 455, 456. (Tr.)

prevented me from carrying my purpose into effect. And if I now transfer to another the cares of a vast empire, I am not doing so out of a desire to consult my own ease or to shirk fresh exertions, but because I feel that to retain them would be to act contrary to your interests. Be loyal to the Catholic faith, which has been always and everywhere the faith of Christendom; for should it disappear, the foundations of goodness would crumble away, and every sort of mischief, now menacing the world, reign supreme." Having taken leave of his subjects, he withdrew to the Hieronymite monastery of Yuste, in Estremadura, where he passed two years, dividing his time between experiments with mechanical contrivances, and religious exercises of such extreme asceticism that they sometimes assumed a character of gloomy extravagance, and died September 21, 1558.[1] He suffered much from doubts as to the rectitude of the political motives by which his policy had been guided, and not unfrequently reproached himself with having neglected to employ adequate means at a proper season to secure the peace of the Church and to prevent schism; and with having sacrificed to his temporal interests the paramount claims of the Church.

Documents recently made public throw much light upon the character of Charles, and have quite reversed the popular and erroneous opinions heretofore prevalent concerning this prince. From these it appears that Charles, far from being a man of contracted views and unworthy prejudices, possessed a fine intellect and large and generous sympathies. This is evident, were other proof wanting, from his favourite authors during the earlier period of his life; for *Thucydides* and *Macchiavelli*, *St. Augustine*, and *St. Bernard* are not the writers that constitute the delight of small and bigoted minds. His whole life goes to show that he was throughout a most devoted son of the Church; that his faith was firm and undoubting, and his piety earnest and sincere. He was a man of restless activity; courageous in adverse and moderate in prosperous fortune; parsimonious towards himself, he was lavish when any public enterprise demanded a generous expenditure; and, though his life was not spotless, compared with the other princes of his time, he exercised a degree of self-denial which at least kept him within the bounds of temperance and decency, and to which they could lay no just claim. He had two natural children—Margaret of Parma and Don Juan of Austria—the former of whom was born to him before his marriage, and the latter after the death of his wife; but so well was the secret of their illegitimacy kept, that Philip learned that Don Juan was his half-brother only a few days before the emperor's death.

[1] Monastic Life of Charles V., by *Stirling* (German by *Lindau*, Dresden, 1853; by *Kaiser*, Lps., 1853). *Prescott*, Monastic Life of Charles V. (German, Lps., 1857). Cf. *Raumer*, Hist. of Europe from the end of the fifteenth century, Vol. I., pp. 581, 582. **Gams*, in Mœhler's Ch. H., Vol. III., pp. 152-154.

D.—Development of Protestantism in Switzerland.

§ 321. *Calvin and his Reform at Geneva—Beza.*

Epistolæ et responsa, Geneva, 1576, fol. Opera (Genev. 1617, 12 vols. f.); Amsterdam, 1671, 9 vols. f.; in the Corpus Reformatorum, Vol. XXIX. sq. *Calvini, Bezæ* aliorumque litteræ quædam, ex autogr. in bibl. Goth., ed. *Bretschneider*, Lps., 1835. (A collection of Calvin's Letters, compiled from the original MSS.; and edited, with historical notes, by Dr. Jules Bonnet, were translated into English by *D. Constable*, 2 vols., 1855-1857. The best edition of Calvin's works is that of Amst., 1671, in 9 vols. fol., of which there is an Engl. transl. in 51 vols. 8vo, published at Edinburgh, 1843-1855. Tr.) Œuvres françaises de J. Calvin, précédés de sa vie, par Théod. de Bèze, Paris (two treatises on the state of the soul after death, on the Lord's Supper, &c.) L'histoire de la vie et la mort de J. Calvin, par *Théodore de Bèze*, Gen. 1564. *Bolsec*, Histoire de la vie de Calvin, Paris, 1577, and frequently. *Henry*, The Life of Calvin, Hamburg, 1835, sq., 4 vols. *Stæhelin*, John Calvin's Life and Select Writings, Elberfeld, 1861-1863, 2 vols. *Late Researches* in the Protocols of the Council of Geneva concerning Calvin, made by the two *Galiffes*, father and son, Geneva, 1865.—*Viguet et Tissot*, Calvin d'après Calvin, Genève, 1864. *Herminjard*, Correspondance des réformateurs (1516-1526), Genève, 1866. †**Kampschulte*, Calvin and his Church and State at Geneva, Lps., 1869, sq, †*Audin*, Histoire de la vie, des ouvrages et des doctrines de Calvin, Paris, 1841, 2 vols. (The Life of Calvin, by J. M. V. Audin, transl. into English by the Rev. J. McGill, Baltimore and Louisville, 1 vol., 8vo. Tr.) Germ., 2 Vols., Augsburg, 1843. Conf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., art. "*Calvin.*" *Hundeshagen*, The Conflicts of Zwinglianism, Lutheranism, and Calvinism in the Church in the territory, of Bern, Bern, 1843. *Guizot*, Les vies de quatre grands chrétiens français, Paris, 1873. (See also *Blanc*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 275; *Merle d' Aubigné*, Hist. of the Great Reformation; *Chambers'* Cyclop., art. "*Calvin.*" Tr.)

John Calvin, the son of Gerard Calvin, was born at Noyon, in Picardy, July 10, 1509. His father began life as a cooper, but subsequently rose to some distinction, as we hear of him holding the offices of procureur-fiscal of the district of Noyon, and secretary to the bishop of the diocese. Young John, being destined by his father for the Church, early gave himself to the study of theology, in which his brilliant talents enabled him to achieve such success, that, like Zwingli, he obtained as the reward of his proficiency several ecclesiastical benefices. But cleverness and study cannot compensate for a bad character and loose morals, and both the character and morals of Calvin were infamous.[1] Leaving off the study of theology for a time, he went to Orleans, where he gave his attention to law, having as his master the celebrated Père de l'Etoile, one of the most distinguished jurists of that age. The new study does not appear to have had much attraction for him, and he again took up theology. He was chiefly indebted to Père Olivetan, a professor at Paris, and to Melchior Wolmar, a professor at Bourges, for his knowledge of the principles of the Wittenberg School, of which the doctrine concerning justification appears to have made the deepest and most lasting impression upon his mind. While at Paris, his bold and open advocacy of the teachings of Luther drew upon him the ill-will of the Sorbonne, and he was in consequence forced to flee the city, notwithstanding that *Francis I.*, influenced by his sister, Margaret of Navarre, was kindly disposed towards him. Leaving Paris, he led a

[1] Abbé *Blanc*, Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 554 (4th ed., Paris, 1867). (Tr.)

wandering life for some time, and finally appeared at Basle, in the year 1534, where he attempted to establish his system, and where he wrote his *great work*, "*The Institutes of the Christian Religion*," which he addressed to Francis I.[1] The work became popular in France, and was the means of securing a numerous following to its author.

The inhabitants of the reformed cantons of Switzerland, repelled by Zwingli's cold and contemptuous views concerning the Lord's Supper, were also inclined to receive with favour the teachings of Calvin, who appears to have been the real founder of the "*Reformed*" denomination in that country. He appealed to *Holy Scripture* more confidently than any other of the reformers, and in his attempts to make its passages fall in with his system and support his peculiar views, surpassed them all in doing violence to the true meaning of the text. But Calvin being a man of fine classical culture, of a philosophic mind, and accurate methods of thought, did not follow the example set him by the Saxon reformers in their insane hostility to all antiquity, and their efforts to banish classic literature and Greek philosophy from the Christian world. Quite the contrary. He was appreciatively grateful for the learning, the eloquence, and the philosophic treasures which, he candidly owned, were contained in the works of the Fathers of the Church and the theologians of the schools; expressed his admiration of the historians, philosophers, and poets of Greece and Rome; and, in giving his opinion of them, did so with warmth indeed, but also with critical acuteness and judicial fairness. If, on the one hand, he was not always original, and occasionally borrowed thoughts and ideas from Luther; on the other, it must be admitted that he showed much skill in the precision and method with which he developed them. But ideas did not constitute his whole debt to Luther. His language was often quite as *coarse*, *vulgar*, and *blasphemous* as that of the great Saxon reformer.[2]

Geneva was the scene of Calvin's most efficient and important labours. After returning from Ferrara, whither he had gone to visit the Duchess Renée, and where, it is said, there were many well disposed towards him, he passed through Geneva. *William Farel* and his associate, *Peter Viret*, who were propagating the new doctrines in the French Cantons of Switzerland, and had been quite successful in their efforts to spread their errors among the people of Vaud, learning that Calvin had arrived in the city, went immediately to see him, and urged him to remain and labour where he was. When the latter demurred,

[1] Institut. relig. Christ. ad reg. Franc. (Bas. 1536), Argent., 1539, Gen. 1559, ed. *Tholuck.*, Berol., 1834 sq., 2 P.; ed *Baum, Cunitz, Reuss*, Brunsvic., 1869. The Institutes consisted originally of six sections, subsequently of four books, viz.: 1. De cognitione, creatoris; 2. De cognitione Dei redemptoris; 3. De modo percipiendæ gratiæ; 4. De externis remediis ad salutem. Conf. *Gerdes*, De Joan. Calv. institut. rel. Chr. (Miscellan. Græningia., T. II., Pt. I.)

[2] Here is one specimen from many. He wrote two works, entitled respectively, "*De æterna Dei prædestinatione*" and "*De libero arbitrio*," against the clever and learned theologian, *Albert Pighius*, in the former of which he says: "Paulo post librum editum moritur Pighius. Ergo ne *cani mortuo* insultarem, ad alias lucubrationes me converti." Cf. *Linsenmann*, Albert Pighius and his theological views (Tübg. Quart. Review, 1866, n. 4.)

preferring to occupy himself wholly in literary labours, Farel, yielding to his impetuous temper, invoked God's curse upon both him and his studies should he refuse to give himself to the well-being of the church of Geneva; and this menace, Calvin confesses, determined the course to be pursued by him.

Unfortunately, an avenue was opened to the introduction of Protestantism, by an alliance entered into between the Genevese and the Canton of Bern, for the immediate purpose of asserting and maintaining the independence of Geneva against the claims of the Duke of Savoy. Their efforts were successful; and, to more completely alienate them from the Church, the bishop, between whom and the citizens there was a conflict of authority, quitted the city, and pronounced sentence of excommunication upon its inhabitants. This was the signal for a general movement against the old faith. Altars were pulled down and demolished, paintings and statues destroyed, and of those who continued faithful to the religion of their fathers, some were *imprisoned*, and others *sent into exile*. Thus was the foundation of the new faith laid upon the desecrated altars of the old; and its existence begun among the ruins it itself had made.

Calvin arrived in Geneva in 1536, and soon completed the work which the less energetic Farel and Viret had commenced.[1] But Calvin, like all reformers whose zeal is not tempered by the wise experience of the Church, went to extremes in endeavouring to correct the loose morals of the city, and to bring all under a uniform code of severe and *stern virtue*. He also gave offence by his arbitrary and despotic manner in setting up his new worship (1538). Little by little public opinion began to set strongly against him, till in the end both he and his adherents were expelled the city by the opposition party, who went under the name of *Libertines*, or *Patriots*.

Calvin now took up his residence in Strasburg, where he began to teach theology, and gathered about him quite a respectable community of persons, sharing his peculiar religious views. Here, too, he made the acquaintance of the widow of a converted Anabaptist, whom he married in 1539.

In the meantime, his adherents in Geneva, who were numerous and devotedly attached to him, longed for his return, and at their invitation he again entered that city in 1541, and from that time forth exercised an authority well-nigh absolute in both civil and ecclesiastical affairs. He established a *Consistorial Court of Discipline*, whose office it was to take cognizance of all infractions of morality, among which were included dancing and other amusements. A system of espionage was organized, whose ramifications extended over the whole city, and whose officers invaded the homes and exercised a strict censorship over the social life, and even the speech of individual citizens. While suppressing all houses of public resort previously existing, Calvin allowed five drinking-rooms to be opened, provided they should be kept by

[1] *Mignet*, Introduction of the Reformation, and Organization of Calvinism in Geneva (German, by *Stolz*. Lps., 1843).

virtuous persons (*gens de bien*), or, in other words, by Calvinists. The Genevese, acting under the guidance of the *Libertines*, became rebellious under pressure of these restraints on their social customs and habits; but Calvin, acting with his usual promptness, energy, and decision, made such use of the despotic power at his command as effectually kept in check for the time every symptom of revolt. So efficient were his police, that should any citizen be rash enough to give utterance to a sentiment disrespectful to his character, or adverse to his policy, the indiscretion was promptly followed by a punishment so terribly severe that others would carefully guard against repeating the offence.[1] Desirous to make Geneva the Rome of Calvinism, he elaborated a *theocratical* system of church-government, and placed himself at its head, with powers so extensive and prerogatives so extravagant, that even those popularly said to have been claimed by the popes in the Middle Ages are limited and temperate in comparison. He had *Castellio*, the translator of the Bible, deposed from his office of regent in the gymnasium, because the latter held certain rationalistic views as to the authenticity of the Song of Solomon; he had the physician, *Bolsec*, banished for assailing the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination; he had *Ameaux*, one of the Council of the Twenty-five, cast into prison, because, *it was said*, he had spoken disrespectfully of both the reformer and his reform; he ordered the execution (1548) of *Gruet* for having written words of menace against him, though he himself had given Gruet abundant provocation for the use of intemperate language, by publicly calling him a *dog* at a meeting of the Council. *Gentilis*, who charged Calvin with holding erroneous views on the Trinity, was in consequence condemned to death, and, though escaping the severe sentence for a time by retracting the charge and offering ample apologies, was eventually beheaded at Berne (1566). *Michael Servede*, a Spanish physician, was seized by the despotic orders of Calvin, while passing through Geneva, and burned at the stake (1553), for having published certain heretical propositions concerning the Trinity. The Libertine, *Berthilier*, underwent a like punishment. It would seem that one who himself explained the mystery of the Trinity so indifferently, and whose views were so vehemently assailed by those of his own sect, should have been a trifle less bloodthirsty towards those who differed from him. These cruel and iniquitous executions, which, as *Bossuet* well observes, were not, as in the case of Luther, the effects of hasty impulse or uncontrollable bursts of anger, but the results of cool, calculating, and unfeeling malignity,[2] have left a stain upon the

[1] The formula of excommunication drawn up by Calvin, in *Audin*, Life of Calvin, *J. McGill's* tr., p. 314, and in *Kober*, the Ban of the Church, p. 16.

[2] *Calvini*, Fidelis expositio errorum Mich. Serveti et brevis eorum refutatio, ubi docetur, jure gladii coërcendos esse hæreticos, 1554 (Opusc., c. 686 sq.) *Melanchthon* has left us an elaborate defence (*Consilia* II., p. 204) of the practice of inflicting *capital punishment* on heretics. Writing to Calvin upon the same subject, he says (*Calvini*, Epp., No. 187): Legi scriptum tuum, in quo refutasti luculenter horrendas Serveti blasphemias, ac Filio Dei gratias ago, qui fuit βραβευτὴς (Umpire) hujus tui agonis. Tibi quoque ecclesia et nunc et ad posteros gratitudinem debet et debebit. Tuo judicio prorsus assentior.

memory of the French reformer which will never be effaced. Having firmly established his political power at Geneva, Calvin, through the agency of the *Academy* which he founded in that city in 1558, experienced little difficulty in replacing the doctrines of Zwingli by his own in the Helvetic Cantons. The ecclesiastical organization of Geneva became a model for that of other countries, and was adopted by the reformed churches of France, the Netherlands, England, Scotland, Germany, and Poland.

Calvin's life was one of unwearied activity, and his labours were so numerous and so onerous that his bodily constitution gradually gave way under them. His health began to break in 1561, and, though less active and energetic than formerly, he lingered on till 1564, when he died on the 27th of May. His memory, long held in honour, has gradually fallen into disrepute. At his third *centennial celebration* in 1864, the inhabitants of Geneva refused to acknowledge him either as their national hero or national saint, and, by way of protesting against the celebration altogether, stuck up posters containing the capital sentences against Servede and Berthilier.[1] In 1862, his latest descendant, a citizen of Noyon, of high standing and good character, returned to the bosom of the Catholic Church.

Theodore Beza, Calvin's eulogistic biographer, took up the work of his master, and carried out his designs with energy and ability. Born of a noble family at Vezelai, in Burgundy, June 24, 1519, Beza received an admirable classical education at Orleans, and at the age of twenty gave evidence of his superior ability and attainments by writing brilliant and witty, but indecent verses. He led for some time a life of fashionable dissipation at Paris; but on his arrival at Geneva, he came into contact with Calvin, by whose austere severity the natural exuberance of his spirits and levity of his character were so toned down and kept in check, that he gradually assumed an air and demeanour more in harmony with the grave deportment of his master. The result of this self-discipline was a happy mixture of *attractive mildness* and *severe reserve*, which made him acceptable to persons of every degree, and a general favourite among the partisans of Calvinism, of which sect he became the acknowledged head and true founder. Moreover, he brought to the defence of the Calvinistic tenets splendid intellectual gifts and an extensive erudition, and though unable, owing to the slavish rigorism of the system, to give full play to his mental powers, managed nevertheless to throw into his pages such classic brilliancy of style as gave him a complete advantage over the hostile attacks of the humanists, and notably of Castellio.

Affirmo etiam vestros magistratus juste fecisse, quod hominem blasphemum, re ordine judicata, *interfecerunt*. *Beza*, De hæreticis a civili magistratu puniendis. *Beza* went so far as to insist that the Antitrinitarians should suffer capital punishment even after they had retracted their errors (*Crenii*, Animadversiones, XI. 90). See *Döllinger*, The Church and the Churches, the Papacy, and the States of the Church, Munich, 1861, p. 68 sq. *Audin*, Life of Calvin, *McGill's* transl., pp. 413-416.

[1] Cfr. Augsbg. Univ. Gaz., No. 154, June 2, 1864.

His felicity in adapting his style to that of the Holy Scriptures is both original and peculiar to himself, and is especially conspicuous in his commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul.[1]

§ 322. *Calvin's System.*

Mœhler, Symbolism, 5th ed., p. 21; Engl. transl., New York, 1844, pp. 123, 159, 181, 207, 292, 323, 407; *Hilgers*, Theology of Symbolism; *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 698-709; *Hepp*, Dogmatics of the Evangelical Reformed Church, Elberfeld, 1861.

The system of Calvin, as has been intimated above, resembles in its general features the teachings of Luther and Zwingli, though, on the whole, it is far more gloomy and severe. He began to depart from Luther's teaching on the question of *free-will*. Luther denied outright the faculty of free-will in man; Calvin, on the contrary, maintained that man did enjoy a certain sort of free-will, but, at the same time, contended that it was subject to a divine predestination of a more formal and sterner character than that admitted by either Luther or Zwingli. The one dominating element and distinguishing characteristic of Calvinism is the doctrine of *absolute predestination*,[2] logically and rigorously deduced from his conception of original sin. The decree of predestination, he maintained, is a consequence of Adam's fall, and is, therefore, eternal and immutable. Moreover, the faculties of man are so utterly and radically corrupted and depraved by original sin, that man has an overmastering tendency to do wrong, and cannot, of himself, though he put forth his best efforts in the attempt, perform a single good action. God, the primordial Author of good and *evil*, had from the beginning set apart a certain number of his creatures, whom He doomed to everlasting punishment, to the end that his justice might be made manifest in them. But that there *might be a pretext* for his wrath and a justification for the punishment, *He caused the First Man to fall into sin*, and visited upon all posterity the consequences of his revolt. Those foredoomed to eternal loss commit sins by a necessity of their being impelled to their commission by the irresistible influence of the divine will. Their intellect is so blinded by divine agency and their will so enfeebled, that the one is incapable of knowing and the other equally incapable of performing aught of good. Such expressions as the following are common in the writings of Calvin: Man, acting under a divine impulse, does what it is not lawful to do—

[1] *Fajus*, De vita et obitu Th. Bezæ, Gen., 1606; *Schlosser*, The Lives of Theodor Beza and of Peter Martyr, Heidelberg, 1809; *Baum*, Theodore Beza, according to authentic sources, Lps., 1843 sq., 2 vols.

Calvin professes to base his teaching on that of St. Augustine; but *Petavius* (*Theologicor. Dogmatum*, Tom. I., lib. X., c. 6-15) shows that there is a wide difference between the two. *Hugo Grotius* makes this very just observation on the character of Calvinism: "Nullum potuit in Christianismum induci dogma perniciosus quam hoc: hominem, qui credidit, aut qui regenitus est (nam hæc multis idem valent), posse prolabi in scelera et flagitia, sed accidere non posse, ut propterea divino favore excidat aut damnationem incurrat. Hæc nemo veterum docuit, nemo docentem tulisset, nec aliud evidentibus vidi argumentum detortæ ad privatos et malos sensus scripturæ, quam in hoc negotio."

The heart of man, obeying a certain mysterious divine influence, turns from the good and pursues the evil—Man falls because an over-mastering Providence ordains that he shall fall.[1] He further held that the reprobate, even at the moment he receives the Sacraments, is as destitute of true faith as he is of sanctifying grace. The following is his definition of predestination: "*By predestination*," he says, "*is understood an eternal decree by which God preordains what shall be the lot of each individual.* For, inasmuch as all are not created for the same end, some will enjoy *everlasting happiness*, and others suffer *never-ending misery*. Hence, according as man is created for the enjoyment of the one or the sufferance of the other, he is said to be *predestined either to life or to death.*"[2] Concerning the doctrine of *justification by imputation*, Calvin went a step beyond Luther, declaring that he who believes is not only *perfectly* assured of his justification, but also of his *eternal salvation*. In regard to the *Sacraments*, he differed from Luther, affirming that sanctifying grace has *no connection* with the visible sign of the Sacrament, and is not invariably efficacious.

His language relative to the *Lord's Supper* and the Eucharistic Presence is insidiously equivocal and purposely obscure. Passages of it would lead one to believe that he is speaking of a true Presence, and a true eating of the Body and drinking of the Blood of Christ, and that he really intends to convey the meaning that the Body of Christ is wholly independent of the faith of the recipient, the unworthy receiving equally with the worthy. But, be this as it may, his teaching is certainly more reasonable and more consolatory than

[1] *Calvin*, Institut., lib. IV., c 18, § 2: "Homo justo Dei impulsu agit quod sibi non licet." Lib. III., c. 23, § 8: "Cadit igitur homo, Dei providentia sic ordinante." Cf. *Mœhler*, Symbolism, p. 128. (Tr.) Calvin makes the following commentary on St. Paul's Ep. to the Romans, ix. 18: "Nam res externæ, quæ ad excæcationem reproborum faciunt, illius iræ (Dei) sunt instrumenta. *Satan* autem ipse, qui intus efficaciter agit, ita est ejus minister, ut *nonnisi ejus imperio* agat. Corruit ergo frivolum illud effugium, quod de *præscientia* Scholastici habent. Neque enim prævideri ruinam impiorum a Domino Paulus tradit, sed ejus consilio et voluntate ordinari." He is not even at a loss for an illustration in confirmation of his doctrine: "Absalon incesto coitu patris torum polluens detestabile scelus perpetrat: *Deus tamen hoc opus suum esse pronunciat*," &c.

[2] The following is a summary of Calvin's teaching on Predestination, as given by *Blunt* (Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology, London, 1872, p. 102): "The teaching of Calvin on Predestination may be summed up in what are called the *Five Points*, a name given to the peculiarities of his system. These are: Election (and non-election or reprobation); redemption, the bondage of the will; grace; final perseverance. His teaching on these subjects will appear from a statement of his theory on Predestination. He maintained that God not only foresaw, but from all eternity decreed, the fall of Adam, and the total corruption of his posterity by sin; all from birth inherit his fallen nature, with its hereditary bond of sin and guilt, and are in a state of utter alienation from God; free-will Godward is totally lost; man in his natural state can do nothing but sin, and that continually. God is pleased for wise reasons, inscrutable to ourselves and independent of the foreseen merits of the objects of his mercy, to elect some from the fallen race to salvation. They are made willing by this grace, which is irresistible or necessarily effectual, to obey the Gospel call, are regenerated by his Spirit, and live in holiness and obedience to his will, and cannot finally fall from a state of grace. The rest of mankind God predestines to eternal destruction, not on account of foreseen sin, though it may aggravate their doom, but in fulfilment of his sovereign purpose or decree. He leaves them in their fallen state without effectual grace, deprived of which they must necessarily perish, as examples of his hatred against sin and for the manifestation of his glory." (Tr.)

that of Zwingli, according to whom the only Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is that "*which exists in the thoughts of a contemplative mind*," and the only significance of the Sacrament itself, a *remembrance* of Christ, his sufferings, and his death.[1] Calvin, while dissatisfied with the cold and heartless theory of Zwingli, was equally at variance in his teaching with *the Catholic dogma of transubstantiation*. He held that the bread and wine are not changed into the Body and Blood of Christ by the words of consecration pronounced by the priest, but *remain* precisely what they were before the act; that the Body and Blood of Christ are in heaven, and there alone, but that at the moment of Communion a *divine power*, emanating from the Body of Christ in heaven, is communicated to the soul of the *believer*. Thus, according to his conception of the Eucharist, it contained two wholly distinct elements—the one material, which falls under the senses; the other spiritual, which constitutes the *divine food* of the soul, is communicated only to those *predestined* to eternal life, and is connected with the material element only in so far as the latter is an occasion for its conveyance. Calvin pretended to support this opinion by citations from Scripture, but relied mainly on the words of St. John: "*It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.*"[2]

Finally, *as regards the Church*, Calvin was quite at one with Luther, both doing their best to misrepresent her history, and to picture her as an abyss of infamy, during the period between the first and the sixteenth centuries. But Calvin's views are widely divergent from those of the Wittenberg doctor concerning the necessity of a distinct body of *ministers in the Church*. The former is clear and definite on this point, maintaining that there shall be three grades in the ministry, viz., pastors, elders, and deacons; and that no one shall assume these offices, unless called of God, *since no man, not having a vocation from God, signified to him through the voice of the people, should take upon him to preach his word and dispense his sacraments*. Hence, in the system of Calvin, *ordination* has a significance and importance attached to it, of which it is nearly, if not quite, destitute in that of Luther; for while, in the former, it is, in a certain limited sense, called a sacrament, and should be conferred, not by the body of the people, but by the presbytery, in the latter it signifies no more than a licence to preach, granted

[1] "Hoc est," said Zwingli (De Vera et Falsa Relig., II., p. 293), "id est, significat Corpus Meum. Quod perinde est, ac si quæ matrona conjugis sui annulum ab hoc ipsi relictum monstrans, En conjux hic est meus, dicat." (Tr.)

[2] VI. 64. "As regards Calvin's theory (of the Eucharist), though he sometimes uses Catholic phraseology and speaks of Christ being in the 'symbol' (in symbolo), and of our being 'partakers of his substance' (participes substantiæ ejus); yet it is certain that he wholly rejected the true doctrine of the Eucharist. Thus he asserts that our Lord's human nature can only be present at the right hand of God, and cannot, in any sense whatever, be present under Eucharistic signs. . . . Calvin maintained that the Eucharist was especially designed to kindle the believer's faith, and to raise his heart to Christ sitting at the right hand of God. He thus illustrates his theory: That as the sun, though so distant, can infuse light and heat, so Christ, though at the right hand of God, shines into the hearts of the faithful receivers, and fills them with his grace and presence." *Blunt*, L. c., p. 623. (Tr.)

by the civil power. Calvin further aimed at making the Church more independent of the civil power than did either Luther or Zwingli, his principle being "*Ecclesia est sui juris*"—a principle, however, which he advocated only for a time. In fine, Calvinistic communities were designed to be wholly independent the one of the other, each constituting a sort of little republic in itself; while, in the Catholic system, individual churches are only parts of a grand organism, extending over the whole world, and depending on a central government and a universally-acknowledged Head—the representative of Christ on earth. But in order to unite the individual churches by some sort of bond, Calvin established *Synods*, which played a much more important part in his than in the Lutheran system. The rigorous exclusiveness of Calvin's opinions, and the inflexible sternness of his character, did not prevent him from stretching a point when he conceived it to be his interest to do so. Thus, for example, he formed a union with the Swiss, when such union seemed necessary for the advancement of his cause; and, in his conference with Dean Bullinger (*Consensus Tigurinus*, 1549), he, like Zwingli, employed language equally hostile to Catholics and Lutherans, saying that it was quite as senseless to affirm either "that the Body of Christ was *under* the forms of bread, or that It was united *with* the bread, as to affirm that *transubstantiation* took place, and that the bread was changed into the Body of Christ."[1] To conclude, Calvin, like Zwingli, was the consistent and inveterate foe of all forms, was ardently bent upon abolishing every sort of outward ceremonial, and manifested the most determined opposition to whatever embellishes divine worship, elevates the soul, or warms the heart.

CHAPTER II.

PROPAGATION OF PROTESTANTISM IN EUROPE.

Döllinger treats this subject very fully in the continuation of Hortig's Church Hist., pp. 481-691.

§ 323. *Protestantism in Prussia.*

Chief Sources. Chronicles of *Simon Grunau* (a Dominican of Danzig), who was an eye-witness to what he relates. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Encyclopæd., Vol. VIII., p. 679 sq. French Trans., Vol. 19, p. 266.

The Margrave, *Albert of Brandenburg*, who had been chosen Grand Master of the Teutonic Order in 1511, when he was scarcely twenty-one years of age, early joined the Protestant League. Western Prussia

[1] Non minus absurdum judicamus, Christum *sub* pane locare vel *cum* pane copulare, quam panem *transsubstantiare* in corpus ejus.

had belonged to Poland since 1466, and the remainder of the country was held in fief of the Polish King, Sigismund, to whom Albert, receiving encouragement from many quarters, refused to render feudal allegiance. Sigismund, in consequence, had recourse to arms to maintain his rights (1519); and Albert, failing to receive the aid that had been promised him, was forced to submit; but, through the friendly offices of the emperor, a four years' truce was agreed to by both parties, at Thorn,[1] April 5, 1521. The Pope also interposed, and made an effort to effect a reconciliation between Albert and Sigismund;[2] but the former had his mind fully made up to prosecute his plans for independence, and would listen to no overture that in any way interfered with his purpose.

In the year 1522, he travelled into Germany, accompanied by *James of Dobeneck*, Bishop of Pomesania, and *John of Polenz*, Bishop of Samland, both of whom were strongly suspected of being favourably disposed towards the new religious teachings. He applied for succour to the Diet of Nürnberg, then in session, but was refused (1522), and, having some idle time on his hands, became one of the audience that flocked to hear *Osiander* expounding the new doctrines. From a curious he became an interested and fascinated listener, and, while in this frame of mind, sought counsel of Luther and Melanchthon as to the best way out of his difficulties, and received the advice to return and abolish the *absurd* and *foolish*, as they termed it, Rule of his Order; to take a wife, and make Prussia a secular dukedom. The advice was accepted, and promptly acted upon.

Albert at once began to cast about for Protestant preachers, and in that very year two Lutherans, *John Brismann* and *Peter Amandus*, were formally installed at Königsberg. Monks were driven from their monasteries, and nuns from their convents; the suspected bishops of Samland and Pomesania publicly declared in favour of Lutheranism (1524); and *Frederic von Heideck*, counsellor to Albert, displayed a singular activity in furthering its interests.

At the expiration of the four years' truce (1525), Albert concluded a treaty of peace at Cracow, with Sigismund, King of Poland, in virtue of which the external portion of eastern Prussia was secured to Albert and his heirs, and the suzerainty of Sigismund over the same territory acknowledged.

When this treaty became known to the provincial estates of the Duchy, the inhabitants, wearied of the protracted and seemingly inveterate feuds with Poland, received the news with transports of joy; while *Weiss*, who had lately succeeded to the bishopric of Samland, as a proof that his sympathies were with the people, surrendered the temporal administration of his diocese to the reigning prince, assigning as a reason for his action that bishops were called to preach, and not to govern.

[1] *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. VIII., p. 681. Fr. Trans., Vol. 19, p. 268. *Chambers'* Cyclop., Art. Albert, Duke of Prussia. (Tr.)

[2] *Petri Bembi*, Epistolæ Leonis X. nomine scriptæ, lib. I., ep. 22; lib. II., ep. 21.

To this general transformation of affairs, only one man of name, the Commander of *Memel*, had the courage and manliness to offer any opposition, and even his resistance was but feeble and temporary. The organization of the new church was rapidly pushed forward, and soon completed; a ritual in the Polish language was introduced (1526); and *John Seclusianus* was appointed preacher at Koenigsberg. Duke Albert was solemnly married, in 1526, to *Dorothea*, daughter of the King of Denmark, an act which he intended as a public disavowal of all further connection with either the Teutonic Order or the Catholic Church, and which he attempted to justify in an apology for his conduct, published at the time, and filled with brutal expressions of contempt against the Church he had betrayed and dishonoured. The Pope protested against this public and shameless apostasy, and called upon the emperor to take rigorous measures for the punishment of the crime. The latter at once declared Albert under ban of the empire, and the Teutonic Order, though stripped of its legal rights, offered an emphatic, but vain, resistance; the action of both was frustrated by the insidious course pursued by King Sigismund.

The Confession of Augsburg was adopted by Albert in 1530, who, in order to possess a nursery of Lutheranism within his dominions, founded the *University of Koenigsberg;* and, knowing that neither the Pope nor the emperor would give it his approval, sought and obtained for it the sanction of the King of Poland. The University soon became the theatre of those *theological discussions* which, in the event, proved so disastrous to *Osiander* himself, their chief author, and, after his death, to his followers, called *Osiandrists*, who, on account of their teachings, were banished from every part of Prussia, in 1567.[1]

Albert, not content with his own apostasy, employed every resource of his power to compel his subjects to follow his example. Holding the principle, "*cujus regio, illius religio*," so subversive of freedom and destructive of the rights of conscience, he forced all his states to cease to obey the Church that had raised them from barbarism and ignorance to enlightenment and civilization; and so successful were his efforts, and so complete the alienation of the people from the ancient faith, that, on his death, in 1568, Lutheranism was everywhere predominant, and neither his successor nor any of his subjects thought of returning to the Catholic Church. *Theiner* has attempted to show that Albert's successor eventually embraced the Catholic faith, but his arguments have been successfully refuted and his conclusions proved incorrect by *Voigt*.[2]

§ 324. *Protestantism in Silesia.*

Ehrenkorn, Church History of Silesia, Freistadt, 1713, Pt. I., from ch, 5th, Pt. II. †*Buckisch* (Royal government clerk at Brieg, Imperial Counsellor and Historiographer),

[1] *Chambers'* Cyclop., Art. Osiander. (Tr.)

[2] *Theiner*, Albert, Duke of Prussia, etc.; his Return to the Catholic Church, a. s. f., Augsburg, 1846. *Voigt*, Letter addressed to Father Augustine Theiner, etc., Koenigsberg, 1846. Conf. *Freiburg* Cyclopæd., Vol. VIII., p. 700. Fr. tr., Vol. 19, p. 289. But, above all, *Ræss*, Converts since the Time of the Reformation, Vol. II., pp. 584-595.

Acts of Religion in Silesia, 7 vols. in fol., unhappily still in MS. This work is the chie source used by *Fibiger* (Master and Prelate of St. Matthew's, Breslau), in writing his Lutheranism in Silesia and the Persecutions suffered by the Roman Catholic Church in consequence, Breslau, 1712-1733, 3 Pts., 4to. †*Bach*, Authentic C. H. of the County of Glatz, Breslau, 1841. †*Buchmann*, Antimosler, or an Attempt to form a just appreciation of Protestant Silesia under Austrian Domination, Spire, 1843. *Hensel*, Hist. of the Protestant Church in Silesia, Lps. and Liegnitz, 1764. *Rosenberg*, Hist. of the Silesian Reformation, Breslau, 1767. *A. Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. III., pp. 91-96; Vol. V., pp. 238-256, 422, sq.; Vol. VI., pp. 140-144, 220-285. *Döllinger*, the Reformation, etc., Vol. I., pp. 226-273.

Previously to the year 1163, Silesia formed part of Poland, but was, after this date, governed by independent dukes. *John, King of Bohemia*, skilfully turning to his own advantage the internal dissensions of the country, so directed affairs that, in 1335, nearly the whole of Silesia acknowledged the sovereignty of the Kings of Bohemia. The duchies of Jauer and Schweidnitz and the bishopric of Breslau resisted for a time, but gradually acquiesced—the two former in the year 1392, and the latter in 1442.

While the Lutheran troubles were still at their height, *Louis II.*, the young King of Bohemia and Hungary, perished fighting the Turks at the battle of Mohacz (1526), and his place was supplied by the *Archduke Ferdinand*, brother of Charles V., whom the Bohemians called to the throne of Bohemia, and to whom the wife of his brother, Louis, transferred the crown of Hungary.

The evil influences of the decay of spiritual life and ecclesiastical discipline, so marked in many countries of Europe during the fifteenth century, and the causes of which are to be sought in the moral degeneracy of the clergy and the worldliness of the bishops, were especially active and conspicuous in Silesia, whose condition was not improved by its alliance with the neighbouring country of Bohemia, where the Hussites were disturbing the public peace and distracting individual minds by religious controversy. Thus prepared for religious innovation, Silesia was one of the first countries of Europe to embrace Lutheranism, and the readiness and alacrity with which its inhabitants accepted the new teachings must be mainly ascribed to the depraved morals of the clergy, an admission which is candidly made by *Fibiger*.[1] There is, however, another and a very important cause which goes a long way in accounting for the rapid spread of error in that country, and which deserves special mention. This is the apostasy and faithlessness of a bishop. *John V.*, who was Bishop of Breslau from 1506 to 1520, so far forgot his dignity as a man and his duty as a prelate that he opened a correspondence with Melanchthon and Luther, and received from these heresiarchs the following flattering eulogy: "Were there ten bishops like John, the rapid spread of the Gospel in Germany would be assured."

It is said that the Lutheran doctrines were first preached (from 1518) in the territory of Baron Zedlitz, in the Duchy of Jauer, by *Melchior Hoffmann*, an Augustinian monk, who was shortly after joined at Freistadt by *John of Reichenberg*, a friend of Melanchthon's.

[1] Cf. Pt. I., ch. 12, pp. 84, 85; *Menzel*, Vol. III., p. 93 sq.

At Liegnitz, Duke Frederic II. was the special friend and patron of Lutheranism. In the year 1523 he installed *Valentine Krautwald*, a Lutheran preacher, in the church of St. John, and appointed two of Luther's friends to chairs in the College of Goldberg. But the main cause of the triumph of Lutheranism in Silesia is to be sought in the action of the Municipal Council of *Breslau*, the capital of the province, which at an early day delared openly in favour of the introduction of the new doctrines. In consequence of a difficulty which arose between the Cathedral Chapter and the Council, the latter body banished the vicars of the parochial church of St. Mary Magdalen, and appointed a number of Lutheran ministers to fill their places. In the year 1522, a mob, assembled in the market-place of the city, proceeded to make a mockery of the holy mysteries of religion, to ridicule the ceremonies of the Church, and to deride monks, nuns, and priests by strutting about in their habits and dress and simulating their actions, while the civic magistrates looked on approvingly and gave signs of encouragement. Moreover, the Council drove the Bernardines from their convent, and confiscated this and other property belonging to the Church. King Louis ordered the property thus illegally seized to be restored; but owing to the menacing attitude of the Turks, who were then seriously threatening his States, he was unable to enforce his decree, and it was in consequence disregarded. For a similar reason the efforts of Pope *Hadrian VI.* (ep. die 23 Julii, 1523), of *James, Bishop of Salza* (1520-1539), and Sigismund, King of Poland, to defend the rights and uphold the dignity of the Catholic Church were ineffectual and nugatory.[1] The civic magistrates grew daily more bold and aggressive, and conscious that they could now act without hindrance, forcibly ejected the worthy *Joachim Zieris*, whom the bishop had appointed Rector of the Church of St. Mary Magdalen, and called to fill his place, under the title of Cathedral Preacher of Breslau, *Doctor Hess* (1523), who had recently proclaimed the Lutheran errors from the pulpit in his native town of Nürnberg. Simultaneously the chaplains of the churches of St. Elizabeth and St. Mary Magdalen, were summoned before the Council, and commanded for the future to acknowledge no superior other than Doctor Hess, a command which, in the following year (1524), was extended to all the clergy of the city, with the additional injunction that "they should put aside all human ordinances and the frivolous interpretations of the Fathers," and in their sermons take their new superior as their model. And so cowardly and subservient had the clergy grown, and so unworthy of their high calling, that among them all, *Doctor Sporn*, Prior of St. Albert's, alone had the manly courage to resist the impertinent demands of the Council, and to say plainly and boldly "*that it was the office of the bishop, and not of magistrates, to give instructions as to the proper method of preaching the Gospel.*" But his outspoken honesty was not appreciated, or rather it was, and

[1] For details, see *Fibiger*, Pt. I., chs. 5-11, pp. 32-77

he was banished the city in consequence.[1] The bishop did what he could to throw obstacles in the way of the installation of Hess, and made the matter the subject of some clever controversial writings. His efforts obtained probably as large a measure of success as those of anyone could, who, holding the office of bishop, was destitute of the gravity, the earnestness, and the firmness so befitting that character. The members of the Council, taking courage from the vacillating weakness of the bishop, went on to commit fresh deeds of violence. The magnificent *convent of the Premonstratensians* on Mount Elbing was razed with the ground (1529), under the frivolous pretext that it might afford a refuge to the Turks, and numerous churches were entered and plundered of their ornaments and precious stones.[2]

The action of Breslau furnished a precedent and example, which was closely followed by the Dukes of Silesia, of whom *Frederic II.*, of *Liegnitz* and *Brieg*, was especially conspicuous for his proselytizing activity.[3] Besides calling in Lutheran preachers from neighbouring territories, and installing them at Goldberg and Liegnitz he gave a general order to all the clergy to preach "*evangelically*," which, failing to do, they were to be deprived of the usual tax heretofore levied upon and paid by the people. With this order, Father *Anthony*, a discalced Carmelite, refused to comply; and for persisting in preaching the Catholic faith, he and the other members of his Order were expelled the country. These so-called Evangelicals entered and pillaged the Catholic churches of *Grossglogau*, and perpetrated deeds of brutal violence upon the inhabitants of that city. Scenes equally saddening were enacted at *Schweidnitz* and other cities and towns of the country, and it was not long before Lutheranism was everywhere triumphant.[4]

King *Ferdinand I.* (1526-1564), though ardently devoted to the Catholic Church, and endowed with an energy and strength of character which admirably fitted him to take up her defence, was unfortunately at this time engaged in repelling the aggressions of the Turks, and in consequence unable to oppose any effectual resistance to the advance of Lutheranism. On the other hand, the *bishops*, who should have been the natural defenders of the Church, and who at that very time were in the possession of great political power, having, in 1526, in addition to their other civic offices, become the governors-general of the country, were wholly given up to secular affairs. Influenced by the spirit, and swayed by the passions of the world, they did not bring to the exercise of the functions of their sacred office the steady, energetic earnestness so indispensable to success in such critical seasons; or, what is still more deplorable, they were Lutherans at heart and would have openly professed the errors they secretly encouraged were they not deterred from doing so by the fear of losing their handsome revenues.[5]

[1] For particulars, see *Fibiger*, Pt. I., ch. 11, 12; and ch. 15, p. 131.
[2] †*Goerlich*, Hist. of the Premonstratensians of St. Vincent's, Breslau, 1836 sq.
[3] *Fibiger*, Pt. I., ch. 14, p. 118 sq.
[4] *Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. V., p. 244 sq.
[5] Concerning the successors in office of James of Saltza, in the See of Breslau, viz.:

As a rule, the parish priests were either lazy or corrupt; and being no longer able to look up to those who were set over them as patterns of virtue, or to seek from them the comfort and counsel so necessary to sustain a priest in the performance of the sacred duties of his office, they offered but a feeble resistance to the commands of arbitrary dukes and insolent magistrates. As a consequence, *Von Senitz*, *Dr. Colo*, and *Kupferschmidt* were the only three priests out of all the clergy in the circles of Brieg, Ohlau, Strehlen, and Nimptsch who had the courage to refuse obedience to the orders of Frederic, and who, rather than deny their faith, went into exile.

It was not long till the Lutherans of Silesia began to quarrel among themselves, as they had done in every other country. The doctrines of *justification* and the *Eucharist* were subjects of the liveliest discussion and the widest divergency of opinion. In these controversies *Gaspar Schwenkfeld*, counsellor to Duke Frederic II. and canon of Liegnitz, a man of vigorous and well-trained intellect, took the most conspicous part.[1]

§ 325. *Protestantism in Poland.* (Cf. § 182).

M. Lubieniecki, Historia reformationis Polonicæ, Freistadt, 1683. Jura et libertates dissidentium in regno Polonicæ, Berolini, 1707, fol. *Friese*, Documents for a Hist. of the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania, Pt. II., Vols. I. and II., Breslau, 1786. Vicissitudes of the Reformation in Poland, Hamburg, 1768-1770, 3 Pts. *Ostrowski*, L. c. (see Vol. II., p. 179), T. III. *Lochner*, Facta et rationes earum familiar. christianar. in Polonia, quæ ab Ecclesia catholica alienæ fuerunt usque ad consens. Sendomir. tempora (Acta Soc. *Jablonovianæ* nova, Lps., 1832, Tom. IV., fasc. 2). *Krasinski*, Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress, and Decline of the Reformation in Poland, Vol. I., London, 1838 (Germ. by Lindau, Lps., 1841). *Lucaszewicz*, Essay of a Hist. of the Dissenters in the city of Posen and in Great-Poland during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Germ. by *Vincent* of *Balitzky*, Darmstadt, 1843).

The introduction of the Reformation into Poland was accompanied by many and serious difficulties, notwithstanding the fact that the country had been in a measure prepared for its reception by the *Hussites* and the *Moravian Brethren*, who had sought a refuge there when fleeing from persecution in other lands. First of all, King Sigismund I. (1501-1548), who was a sincere Catholic, and earnestly devoted to the interests of the Church, put forth every effort to prevent the errors of Protestantism from tainting the minds of the Polish people, whose instincts and sympathies were then, as they have been in every age since their conversion to Christianity, deeply and intensely Catholic.[2] Learning that the young Poles, who had made their studies at Wittenberg, following the examples set them by the young men of other countries, had brought home with them some of the writings of Luther,

Balthasar of Pommnitz (1539-1562); *Gaspar of Logau* (1562-1574); *Martin Gerstmann* (1574-1585); *Andrew Gerin* (1585-1596); *Paul Albert* (1596-1600); *John Sitsch* (1600-1609); conf. *Buchmann*, L. c., pp. 9-11; and *Herber*, Silesiæ sacræ Origines, p. 82 sq. On the satisfaction of the Protestants at the election of Balthasar Pommnitz, conf. *Menzel*, Vol. III., p. 93 sq.

[1] This subject will be treated in detail in § 341.

[2] Conf. Agenda secundum Rubricam eccl. Metropol. Gnesnen. edit., 1508, Cracoviæ, which had been in use long before Luther lived.

and were industriously engaged in scattering them among his subjects, he at once took every possible precaution to stop the spread of these mischievous publications. It was enacted at the Diet of Thorn (1520) that no one should have the writings of Luther in his possession. The efforts of Sigismund to preserve the purity of faith in Poland were ably seconded by *John Laski*, Archbishop of Gnesen († 1531), and *Andrew Krzycki*, Chancellor to Queen *Bona*, and subsequently Bishop of Przemysl (1524), both of whom were among the most zealous defenders of Catholic doctrine in that age.[1] A commission was also appointed to make search for and confiscate all heretical books. But, in spite of all these measures, Protestantism found its way into the *University of Cracow*, where it was introduced by *Martin Glossa*. It was preached at *Posen* by *John Seclusian*, who first published in print[2] a *complete* translation of the New Testament in the Polish language (1551-1552), and at *Danzig* by the monk *Jacob Knade* (1518), through whose exhortations a number of the burghers were led to ask to be formally instructed in the new teachings. Knade, though obliged to flee from the anger of an indignant people, was soon brought back to the city by his partisans. Others of the Lutherans did not fare so well. Some of the more intemperate were put to death, and some received orders to quit the city within a fortnight; while monks and nuns, who had broken their vows and married, were commanded to be away within twenty-four hours. The only effect of these measures was to excite the passions of the inhabitants, who now expressed themselves with so much vehemence in favour of the new teachings that the king, fearing they might rise in revolt and make themselves masters of the city, thought it prudent to adopt more moderate counsels. From Danzig Lutheranism was carried to the cities of *Thorn* and *Elbing*. To prevent the further spread of error, it was enacted at the Synod of *Petrikau* that the followers of Luther should be arrested and brought to trial, and such measures taken against them as would effectually repress the heresy. One of these was a prohibition forbidding anyone to hold public office in Poland who had made his studies at Wittenberg. The decree, however, was never rigorously enforced.

But, in spite of this vigorous opposition, Protestantism, protected and encouraged by a free-thinking nobility, steadily gained ground, and at the death of Sigismund I. had invaded many of the provinces of Poland. To add to the strength and swell the number of the Polish Protestants, in the succeeding reign of *Sigismund Augustus II.* (1548-1572), a large body of *Bohemian Brethren*, who had been sent

[1] Consult above all the Diocesan Statutes, and the very old collection of them by *John Laski*, and another by *Stanislaus Karnkowski*, both of which have been arranged in five books and edited by *Wenzyk*, Cracow, 1630.

[2] We say advisedly "*in print*," for even as early as the fourteenth century Polish authors make mention of translations of various portions of the Bible into their language They specify the Psalter, and in fact nearly every book of both the Old and New Testaments. Cf. *Le Long*, Bibliotheca sacra in binos syllabos distincta, etc., Paris, 1723, fol., Sectio III., Biblia Polonica, p. 439 sq.

into exile by King Ferdinand, arrived at Posen. But the citizens soon tired of their presence, and the exiles again setting out on their pilgrimage directed their course towards *Marienwerder*, in West Prussia.

It soon appeared that the new king's opposition to the teachings of Protestantism was vacillating rather than decided, and feeble rather than energetic; and in consequence Poland became the asylum where sectaries of nearly every conceivable shade of opinion sought refuge. Thither flocked *Bohemian Brethren* and *Lutherans*, *Reformed Christians* and *Unitarians* (Socinians), from Switzerland and Italy. Among these last, the most prominent were the Franciscan, *Lismanin*, confessor to Queen Bona, and *John of Lasko*, whose name was well known in England.

Prince *Radziwill* of Lithuania, a zealous member of the Reformed Christians, following the example of the Lutherans, had a translation of the Bible made into the Polish language, according to the sense of his own sect, and published in 1563.[1]

In 1555, a "*national Synod*," composed of delegates from every province, and presided over by the king, was held at Petrikau, when it was determined to arrange for a conference of Catholic bishops and Protestant divines, to which *Melanchthon*, *Lasko*, *Calvin*, and *Beza* were to be invited, and a symbol of faith drawn up, which should embrace general principles recognized by all, and ignore such teachings as some would not accept.[2] The king, strange to say, approved the action of the "Synod," and requested Pope *Paul IV.* to authorize the Mass to be said in the Polish language, to permit Communion to be taken under both kinds, to give priests leave to marry, to sanction the convocation of a *national council*, and to abolish the payment of annats. These requests, as might have been foreseen, were denied. The danger which threatened the Catholic Church grew daily more grave and alarming. The Polish nobles, thoroughly rationalistic in principle, and thoroughly Protestant in sympathy, and exercising over the minds of their serfs a supremacy as complete in the spiritual order as that which they exercised over their bodies was in the material, alienated these poor people from the Church, though nothing could have been more unnatural to the Polish heart, or more revolting to Polish instincts, than the principles of the Protestant religion.

But the fierce quarrels, which here as elsewhere broke out among the Protestant sects directly on their securing the ascendancy, alarmed the country; and thoughtful people began to foresee that if the principles of Protestantism became active in the national life, the unity of

[1] The first *printed* edition of the New Testament published by Catholics was brought out, in 1556, at Cracow, by *Scharfenberger*. A complete translation of the Bible (by John Leopolita) appeared at Cracow in 1561. The translation by the Jesuit, *John Wujek*, was issued between the years 1593 and 1599, and was accompanied with the Hebrew and Greek texts, and supplemented with commentaries intended to elucidate difficult passages and to furnish arguments for the defence of the Catholic faith against the attacks of heretics.

[2] *Lukaszewicz*, Hist. of the Ref. Church in Lithuania, Lps., 1848, 1 Vol.

Poland would be shattered, and its very existence as a kingdom threatened. To avert so great a disaster, the Protestant sects, each differing from and antagonistic to all the rest, but all harmonising in their rancorous hostility to the Catholic Church, met in council at *Sandomir* in 1570, and drew up and signed a symbol, couched in terms so general and indefinite that each might accept its articles and yet have the fullest liberty to believe what they liked.[1] Deriving a fictitious strength from this union, they were able, during the interregnum which followed the death of Sigismund Augustus, to conclude a religious peace, called the *Peace of the Dissidents* (*Pax dissidentium*, 1573), which set forth that Catholics and *Dissidents* were to remain for ever at peace with each other, and both to enjoy equal civil rights. *Henry of Valois*, the newly-elected king, was compelled to take oath that he would maintain the conditions of this peace. He shortly returned to France, and *Stephen Bathory*, Prince of Transylvania (1575-1586), was chosen in his room. Among the intimate friends of this prince were many Catholics of ability and learning, who exercised no little influence upon his mind. But while manifesting a more commendable zeal in the Catholic cause than any of his immediate predecessors had done, he yet refused to take any definite and decided step, feeling himself bound to respect the secret treaty (1557) of Sigismund Augustus, granting freedom of conscience and worship to three cities of Danzig, Thorn, and Elbing, whose inhabitants were long known to be favourably disposed towards Protestantism. But a severer trial and more threatening danger were yet to come upon the Polish Church. *James Uchanski*, Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland, publicly favoured Protestantism, and exerted himself to bring about a rupture with Rome. This attempt to alienate the Court of Rome and the Polish nation, had it been completely successful, would have been followed by consequences the most disastrous, and rendered the stay of the Papal Legates, *Lippomani* (since 1556) and *Commendone*, in the country extremely difficult.

The hopes of the Catholic party were revived, and their influence among the nobles augmented, by the accession of *Sigismund III.*, heir to the crown of Sweden, to the throne of Poland (1587-1632); and, as a consequence, a very decided reaction set in against Protestantism. Moreover, God raised up to Himself at this time priests eminent alike for their piety, their learning, and their zeal, such as *Stanislaus Hosius*,[2] Bishop of Ermeland (†1579), through whose energetic resistance the ravages of heresy were stayed, and through whose purity of faith and holiness of life the Poles were encouraged and strengthened to cling to

[1] *Jablonski*, Hist. consensus Sendomirensis, cui subjicitur ipse Consensus, Berol, 1731, 4to.

[2] *Stan. Hosii*, Cardin. Major. Poenit. et episcopi Varm., vita auctore Stan. *Rescio*, Rom. 687. His principal work is Confessio fidei—veræ chr. Catholicæque doctrinæ solida propugnatio ctr. Brentium (1557). Cf. †*Eichhorn*, Cardinal Hosius, Bishop of Ermeland, Mentz, 1854, 2 vols. Constitutiones Synodales diœceseos Varmiensis, Brunsbergi, 1612, 4to.

the belief of their fathers. The learning, the conflicts, and the triumphs of this holy bishop were such that his name was held in honour by the Universal Church, and he was selected, after he had become cardinal, to preside for a time over the Council of Trent, where he was acknowledged to be one of the ablest of the great theologians who constituted that body. His polemical writings are among the very best of that age, and his exalted virtues and apostolic zeal are still gratefully commemorated at the *Lyceum Hosianum* of Braunsberg, which bears his honoured name.

Another Catholic champion, equally distinguished for learning, eloquence, and living, energetic faith, was *Stanislaus Karnkowski* († 1603), Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland,[1] who, with the frankness of a saint and the fearlessness of an apostle, wrote in the following words to Sigismund Augustus: "Emulate the example of thy father and the piety of thy ancestors in preserving inviolate in thy kingdom, no less than in thy own heart, the old faith, the ancient Catholic religion."

These confessors of the faith were ably seconded in their labours by the *Jesuits*, whose Order had spread rapidly, and was now firmly established in Poland, and under whose direction a large number of colleges had already passed. Among the Polish Jesuits, whose names came most prominently forward during the conflict against Protestantism, *James Wujek* (*Vangroviecensis*) deserves special mention for his zeal, ability, and untiring activity. Having completed his philological and scientific struggles at the universities of Cracow and Vienna, and taught mathematics for a time at Rome, he entered the Society of Jesus in the year 1565. In after years he passed much of his time in the Colleges of *Posen*, *Clausburg*, and *Cracow*, and acquired no little celebrity as a preacher and controversial writer.[2] His translation of the Bible into the Polish language, which he made at the request and under the patronage of *Stanislaus Karnskowski*, Archbishop of Gnesen, is a work of great merit, and even at this day enjoys the special distinction of being the only one approved by the Church of Poland († June 27, 1597).

There were also three others belonging to religious orders who played a prominent part in the religious affairs of Poland during these years. The first was *Peter Skarga*,[3] a Jesuit. He was a good theologian, possessed a clear, well-trained, and vigorous mind, and was solidly erudite. He was, moreover, a skilful, eloquent, and powerful speaker, and as his dogmatical and controversial sermons,

[1] His exertions to have the *Roman Catechism* translated into Polish are worthy of all commendation. Apart from his *Diocesan Statutes*, his fame rests chiefly upon his sermons on the *Eucharist* and the *Messiah*; the former published at Cracow in 1602, and the latter at the same place in 1597.

[2] Postilla major, and minor (in Polish). De missa et Deitate Verbi divini contra consens. Sendomir. Vita et doctrina Salvatoris ex quatuor evangel. De ecclesia cathol.—Hymni.

[3] Sermons, new edit., Lps. 1843. Extracts from Baronius, Rocyne-dzieje koscielne, etc., Cracow, 1603, fol., continued from 1198 to 1645, by *Kwiatkiewicz*, Kalisz, 1695, fol. Lives of the Saints; on the reunion of the Latin and Greek Churches (in Polish); libb. III. dissertationum de Eucharistia.

replete with patristic lore, amply attest, the greatest preacher whom Poland has ever produced († 1612). The next was *Fabian Birkowski*,[1] a Dominican, and Skarga's successor as preacher to the Court of Cracow. He is remembered chiefly by his sermons for Sundays and holidays, which are quite numerous, and portions of which are not unfrequently quoted as models of impassioned eloquence († 1636). The third was *Martin Bialobrzeski*,[2] abbot of the convent of Mogilno and suffragan bishop of Cracow, who, through his homilies, modelled after those of St. John Chrysostom, became the great popular preacher of Poland. He was also the author of a *Complete Catechism*, which is a masterpiece of its kind, and did much to foster among the clergy a taste for imparting Christian instruction, of which the young are always in so much need, and by which they profit so largely († 1585.) In the meantime, the Protestants of Poland, who had been treated with unusual kindness, incited by theologians at home and princes abroad, carried themselves with all the insolence of superiors and the haughtiness of conquerors, and have left upon record very exaggerated accounts of the cruelties they claim to have endured, of the measures taken against them by Sigismund III., and of the policy pursued by the Jesuits, which, it must be admitted, sometimes bordered on severity. The rupture between the Catholics and Dissidents finally became complete and irreparable. These dissensions were deplored by *Ladislaus IV.* (1632-1648), one of the most worthy princes of his age, with the keen grief of a father sorrowing over the alienation of different members of his own family. He appealed, but in vain, to the Poles to come together at the *Religious Conference of Thorn* (1644), and there devise measures which might make them once more a united people. His motives were misconstrued; and even had his words been listened to and acted upon, they could hardly have averted from Poland the disasters with which that country was threatened.[3]

§ 326. *Protestantism in Livonia, Courland, Esthonia, Hungary, and Transylvania.*

Under the Grand Master, *Walter of Plettenberg* (1521), Livonia severed its connection with the Teutonic Order. In order to escape the authority of the Archbishop of Riga, who showed a stubborn constancy in defending the prerogatives of his office and maintaining the rights of the Catholic Church, Walter embraced Protestantism, thinking this the surest way to a triumph over the archbishop and his clergy. This was the origin of the Protestant communes of *Riga* (1523), *Dorpat*, and *Reval*, all of which joined the Schmalkaldic League. When at length William, Margrave of Brandenburg, and brother to the Duke of Prussia, became Archbishop of Riga, the whole of Livonia

[1] Sermons for the Sunday and Feast days, in two series, 1620 and 1628.

[2] Postilla orthodoxa, 1581, 2 vols., shortly after translated into German. Catechismus, Cracoviæ. 1666, 4to (387 pages). These two works are written in Polish.

[3] Cf. § 354

passed under the influence of Protestantism.[1] Lutheranism was introduced into Courland by *Gothard Kettler*, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, who, in 1561, assumed the title of Duke of Courland and Semgallen, ceding to Poland that part of Livonia lying beyond the Dwina, on condition that the inhabitants should be permitted to profess the Augsburg Confession. The defection of Courland was precipitated by the conduct of *John of Mœnnighausen*, bishop of that country, who sold his see to the King of Denmark for the sum of thirty thousand thalers (1559), and, retiring to Germany, embraced Protestantism and took a wife.[2]

The students from Wittenberg were chiefly instrumental in introducing Protestantism into *Hungary*.[3] At the request of the Catholic clergy, severe laws were enacted against the Lutherans by the Diet of Pesth in 1525. But amid the universal decay of ecclesiastical institutions, the clergy neither commanded the respect nor possessed the authority requisite to successfully uphold the declining fortunes of the Church. As a consequence, five royal free-cities of Upper Hungary, viz., *Leutschau*, *Seben*, *Bartfeld*, *Eperies*, and *Kaschau*, declared in favour of Lutheranism at the Synod of Eperies. Moreover, owing to the death of the king, who perished in the disastrous battle of Mohacz in 1525, the approach of the Turks, and the prevalence of civil discord, it was found impossible to carry into effect the decrees of the Diet of Pesth.

While the two kings, Ferdinand of Austria and John Zapolya, were engaged in making war upon each other, the nobles availed themselves of the opportunity to seize the estates of the vacant bishoprics, and secured their plunder by going over to Protestantism. The most active agent of Protestantism in Hungary at this time was *Matthias Devay*, who, having at first professed Lutheranism, became a Zwinglian in 1543, and in 1545 held a sort of synod at *Erdoed*, in the county of Szathmar, at which twenty-nine ministers assisted. In the year 1548, the *Diet of Presburg*, in the name of the king and the estates, issued an edict for the suppression of heresy and the maintenance of the true faith, but it failed of its purpose; and Protestantism, enjoying the patronage and protection of *Thomas Nadasdy*, the new Palatine (since 1544), steadily gained ground, until its progress was retarded here as elsewhere by dissensions among the sectaries themselves. Some, relinquishing the profession of the Augsburg Confession, embraced the teachings of Zwingli, while others preferred the sterner

[1] *Tetsch*, Ch. H. of Courland, Riga, 1767-1777, three parts. An abridgment of it is found in *Nova Acta* hist. eccl., T. VIII., p. 649 sq., T. X., p. 865, 1721, and in *Acta* hist. eccl. nostri temporis, T. II., p. 456 sq., 1711 sq.

[2] *Schlœzer* and *Gebhadi*, Hist. of Lithuania, Livonia, and Courland, Halle, 1785, 4to.

[3] *Lehmann*, Hist. diplomatica de statu rel. evang. in Hung., 1710, fol. Hist. eccles. reform in Hungaria et Transsylvania (auct. *P. C. Debreccen*) acces. locuplet. a *F. A. Lampe*. Traj. ad Rhen., 1728. Memorabilia August. confess. in regno Hung. a Ferd. I. ad Carol, VI. recens. *Joan Ribini*, Poson., 1787-1789, 2 T. Cf. *Engelhardt*, Ch. H. Vol. IV., p. 217. *Joh. Szeberinyi*, Corpus maxime memorabil. synodorum evangelic. Augustan. confession. in Hungaria, Pesthini, 1848.

tenets of Calvin. The Synod of *Tarczal*, held in 1563, adopted the Symbol of Beza, and commanded that the instruction given to the people concerning grace and predestination should be based upon the teachings of Calvin.

Calvinism was soon the predominant religion of Hungary, and its adherents, assembled at the Synod of *Czenger*, spoke of the Lutherans as a carnal and stupid set, who taught that the Eucharist was a bloody and cruel sacrifice. The Lutherans, on the other hand, declared at the Synod of *Bartfeld*, held in 1594, that the solution of all theological difficulties was to be sought in the writings of Luther, which were also the last resource in deciding the merits of theological discussions.

The virtuous *Nicholas Olahi*, Archbishop of Gran, and the *Jesuits*, who had been established at the college of Tyrnau since 1561, were especially conspicuous for their vigorous and manly defence of the Catholic faith. On the 10th of April, 1560, a *Synod* held at *Tyrnau* decreed that all ecclesiastical property in the possession of laymen should be restored to the Church. The destruction of the college of the Jesuits by fire temporarily suspended their labours in Hungary, which they quitted in 1567, but only to come back again in 1586.

The new doctrines were introduced into Transylvania by some merchants of Hermannstadt, who had picked them up at Leipsig, where they passed a portion of the year 1521, and by two Silesian preachers, who proclaimed them publicly through the country. In 1523 severe measures were enacted to prevent the spread of the new errors, but nothing came of them; and in the following year a Lutheran school was set up at Hermannstadt, while in the meantime the nobles displayed their zeal by seizing the property of the Church.

After the battle of Mohacz, which was no less disastrous to Transylvania than to Hungary, the Protestants grew more bold and aggressive, and the authorities of Hermannstadt drove the monks from their monasteries and expelled them and all other Catholics from the town (1529). *John Honter* preached with great applause at Kronstadt, and spread everywhere the teachings of Luther. It was not long before the Mass was abolished in many parts of Transylvania, and Communion distributed under both kinds (1542). The fathers assembled at the *Synod of Mediasch* were afflicted to learn that the nations of the Saxons, invited into the country by King Geisa II. in the twelfth century, had unanimously declared their profession of the Augsburg Confession. The Magyars also declared in favour of the Reformed, while the Wallachians remained united to the Greek Church. During the contest for the crown of Hungary, in 1556, the provincial Diet of Klausenburg granted the fullest freedom of religious worship. Disorder and confusion were now at their height. The Lutherans were straining themselves to the utmost to crush the adherents of the Reformed Church; and the Unitarians, while fleeing persecution in other lands, and seeking a refuge here, added another element to the existing chaos, by demanding equal rights with other religionists,

which were granted them by the provincial Diet of *Maros Vasarhely* in 1571.

The first complete translation of the Bible, made upon the Vulgate and the version of Luther, was edited by *Gaspar Heltai*, a Lutheran preacher of Klausenburg, and appeared in 1562. A second, the work of *Gaspar Karoly*, a preacher of Goenz, corrected by *Abraham Molnar*, a Reformed preacher, was published in 1589.

§ 327. *Protestantism in Sweden.*

Olai Petri Swenke Krönica (Olai Petri's Swedish Chronicle), ed. *Klemming*, Stockholm, 1860 (to 1520). *Baaz*, Inventarium eccl. Sueco-Gothor., Lincop. 1642,, 4to. *Messenius*, Scandia Illustrata, Stockholmiæ, 1700, 8 vols., fol. *Fr. Rühs*, Hist, of Sweden, Halle, 1805-1814, 5 vols, especially Vols. I. and II. *Geijer*, Hist. of Sweden, Hamburg, 3 vols. †**Aug. Theiner*, Sweden and her relation to the Holy See, under John III., Sigismund III., and Charles IX.. according to secret State papers, two parts, Augsburg, 1838-1839 (the second part contains a collection of pieces, filling 350 pages). *Clarus*, Sweden Once and Now, 2 vols.

By the celebrated treaty, known as the *Union of Calmar* (1397), the supreme government of the three northern kingdoms of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark was placed in the hands of the Danish kings, who, it was provided, were to be chosen by delegates representing these three countries. It was hoped that this measure would unite the three kingdoms, give them common interests and common aspirations, but subsequent events showed the hope to be fallacious. Instead of removing it fostered old, and was the prolific source of new jealousies, and caused ancient national hatreds to burn with fresh and increased violence.

Bloody conflicts followed, which, while diminishing respect for the throne and weakening its authority, *extended the influence and augmented the wealth of the nobility and the clergy.* The clergy, however, used their power humanely. Their rule was mild and benevolent, and religion flourished among the people no less than among the nobility and the ecclesiastics.

The Swedes were devotedly attached to the Supreme Head of the Church. Their religious feasts, such as those they celebrated conjointly with the Finns at Abo in 1513, and at Linkoeping in 1520, on the occasion of the public announcement of the canonization of their countrymen, *Hemming* and *Nicholas*, they regarded as national festivals.

Politically, these people were not equally happy. The noble and courageous *Sten Sture*, the Younger, while at the head of the Swedish Government, made an effort to throw off the yoke of Denmark, but being already involved in a quarrel with *Trolle*, the perfidious Archbishop of *Upsala*, he was at a disadvantage, and was beaten by *Christiern II.* of Denmark in 1519. No sooner had Christiern been crowned King of Sweden by Trolle than he gave orders for the terrible massacre of Stockholm, which was continued from the 8th to the 10th of November, 1520, and in which, besides a host of others,

ninety-four Swedish nobles perished. The subserviency of Trolle was rewarded with the office of Regent of Sweden. Among the victims of these fatal days was the father of the intrepid *Gustavus Ericson* of the house of *Wasa*, who, while still young, had been given up as a hostage to Christiern. Having made good his escape from his own country, Gustavus sought an asylum at Lübeck, where he was kindly received, and after obtaining substantial assistance from the municipal authorities, again returned to Sweden; and, calling upon his countrymen to rise and assert the freedom of their country, he put himself at their head, met and defeated the Danes, and, amid universal enthusiasm, was proclaimed Administrator of the State in 1521, and two years later chosen King of Sweden by the Diet of Strengnaes. In order to avert from his country the periodical evils and political agitations incident to elective monarchies, Gustavus exerted himself to make the succession in Sweden hereditary. His familiarity with the teachings of Luther, with which he had become acquainted during his stay at Lübeck, greatly facilitated the execution of his project. He publicly declared his hostility to the episcopacy and the ancient nobles of the land, and avowed his intention of establishing a new Church, and creating a new nobility. "He would not suffer himself to be crowned," he said, "until he had abolished the Catholic episcopacy, and subverted the ancient Church." Among his most active and energetic assistants in bringing about these changes were the brothers *Olof* and *Lawrence Peterson*, both of whom had made their theological studies at Wittenberg, and returned to Sweden in 1519. The former was the most distinguished preacher of Stockholm, and the latter held a professorship at Upsala *Lawrence Anderson*, Archdeacon of Strengnaes, and subsequently Chancellor to Gustavus Wasa, became the patron of the Peterson brothers, whose teachings he embraced. Such of the people and clergy as offered any resistance were made to submit by force; bishops who, like *John Braske* of Linkoeping, and *Peter Jakobson* of Westeraes, as also *Knut*, Provost of the Cathedral, preferred fidelity and duty to apostasy, were deposed and deprived of their dignities, while the Dominicans were banished the country.

Gustavus, while thus putting forth his best efforts to destroy the Catholic Church in Sweden, cunningly concealed his real intentions from John Magnus Gothus, the Papal Legate, and in numerous letters, addressed to Pope Hadrian VI., simulated a sincere attachment to the Catholic faith. To the latter he wrote as follows:—"In order to extirpate as speedily as possible the dangerous teachings of the Hussites, which a certain Augustinian monk, called Luther, is again reviving and attempting to spread, thereby imperilling the public peace, we have forbidden all our subjects individually, under penalty of loss of goods and even life, either to propagate the teachings of the said Luther, to introduce his writings into our States, to buy them, to sell them, or to make any use whatever of them." Gustavus, however, arranged a public *Discussion* to take place at

Upsala between *Olof Peterson* and *Peter Galle*, in the course of which very nearly the same propositions that had been discussed at Leipsig were controverted and defended. Like Luther, Olof, who had little knowledge of Church history, put whatever interpretation upon Holy Scriptures best suited his purpose, and finding himself driven to absurdities by his own concessions, had recourse to intemperate language and personal abuse.

Desirous of despoiling the Church of her wealth, and feeling that the iniquitous proceeding needed some justification, Gustavus sought a sanction for his conduct in arguments drawn from Luther's tract "*On the Confiscation of Ecclesiastical Property*," and charged the professors of the University of Upsala, who by this time had all become Lutherans, with the congenial work of defending the sacrilegious robbery. When the royal commissioners presented themselves, the Archbishop of Upsala protested against their violence, and the inhabitants of the city took up arms and rushed to his defence. The wily monarch, under a specious pretext, decoyed the archbishop to the royal palace, where he amply atoned for the crime of being the object of the admiration and love of his people. While other pastors and the inferior clergy were allured into keeping silence by seductive but fallacious promises, *the cloistered nuns of Wadstena*, though subjected to acts of brutal violence, made a most determined and heroic resistance. Pope Clement VII. called upon the king to desist from plunder and outrage, but his voice fell upon ears deaf to the accents of justice or sorrow.

Magnus Knut, the Archbishop elect of Upsala, and *Peter Jakobson*, Bishop of Westeraes, were condemned to death on the specious pretext of having incited and encouraged the inhabitants of the valleys in their hostility to the king. Their persons were subjected to the vilest indignities before, and their bodies after, execution. A crown of straw was placed upon the head of Jakobson, and a mitre of bark upon that of Knut; both were placed upon half-starved horses, with their faces towards the tails, and in this ignominious condition conducted through the city to be scoffed at by the multitude. After their execution their bodies were torn upon the wheel, and then cast out to be devoured by birds of prey (February, 1527). At the Diet of Westeraes (1527), where the two parties confronted each other, and manifested feelings of furious hostility, Gustavus, feigning much sorrow and great distress on account of the sad condition of affairs, professed his inability to govern under the circumstances, and declared his intention of abdicating. The artifice was clever and successful. The fear that, if the king should carry his threat of abdicating into execution, the country would lapse into anarchy, had its effect upon the Diet. The property of all bishoprics, convents, and cathedral-chapters was made over to him, and the nobles were authorized to take possession of all lands which their ancestors, as far back as the year 1453, had bestowed upon the clergy. As a consequence, the Church in Sweden was reduced to a condition of utter destitution

Gustavus, feeling that the moment was now come when he might throw aside all disguise, publicly proclaimed that it was necessary to go back to the true word of God, which, he added, the new teachers were announcing. The Reformation was forthwith inaugurated by the adoption of a *liturgy in the vulgar tongue*, and the abolition of the rule of clerical celibacy.[1] When these preliminary measures had been fully carried out, the formal establishment of the Reformation was accomplished by the *Assembly of Oerebro* in 1529. In the year 1531 the archiepiscopal see of Upsala was conferred upon Lawrence Peterson, who then took a wife, and, being not wholly insensible to the fascinations of this world, had the good taste to select one of noble lineage.

It was not long, however, before Peterson and the new teachers began to experience some of the humiliation and bitterness consequent upon having a despot like Gustavus for their master. He told them plainly "that priests should not carry themselves like lords, and that if they should ever attempt to wield the sword, he knew of a very summary way of preventing them."

On the other hand, the leaders of the Reformation, Olof Peterson and Lawrence Anderson, made personal attacks upon the king in their sermons, and entered into *a conspiracy against his life*. The plot was discovered, and its authors condemned to death by the Estates of Oerebro (1540), a penalty which they escaped only by the payment of a heavy fine. In addition to this, Anderson was deprived *forever* of his office and dignity, and, withdrawing into obscurity, died, in 1552, at Strengnaes, the very city in which he had first raised the standard of revolt against the Catholic Church, forsaken by his friends and despised by everyone else. In the year 1544 the *Diet of Westeraes* at length made the crown of Sweden hereditary upon Gustavus and his male issue.

In Sweden, as in every other country, the corruption of faith was coincident with the corruption of morals. Gustavus, interpreting a frightful storm that swept over the country as a divine visitation, and regarding himself as *the Supreme Head of the Church*, commanded the observance of an eight days' fast (June 8, 1554). A similar fast was ordered by the Archbishop of Upsala in 1558, "because," said he, "a great many persons, under plea of exercising an evangelical liberty, commit sin as a matter of course, thinking seemingly such evil living to be the end of the Gospel we preach."

Gustavus died September 10, 1560, and when his eldest son, *Eric XIV.*, ascended the throne, the condition of the Catholic Church was unchanged. Almost immediately after the accession of Eric a violent conflict broke out between the Calvinists on the one side and the

[1] *Rœmer*, De Gustavo I. rer. sacr. in Suecia sæc. XVI. instauratore, Ultraj., 1840. The Aulic Chapel, dedicated in honour of *St. Nicholas*, still bears the inscription: Pio regis glorios. mem. Gustavi zelo a superstitionibus papisticis an. 1527 repurgata. See the Swedish Lutheran Mass (liturgy) from the *Kyrie* to the Benedicamus Domino, in *Kist*, Dänisches und Schwedisches, Mentz, 1869, p. 465.

Lutherans on the other. The former were led by one *Denis Beurreus*, a Frenchman, who was an intimate friend of both Calvin and Beza, and had, by his address, obtained an ascendency over the young king's mind; and the latter by *John Oseg*, Bishop of Westeraes. The plans of the Calvinists miscarried, and their defeat was followed on September 14, 1568, by the dethronement and imprisonment of Eric, who, after enduring for eight years every sort of indignity, was finally forced to put an end to his life by taking poison (February 25, 1577).[1]

John III., the younger brother of Eric, and his successor to the throne (1568-1592), wearied and disgusted with the everlasting contentions of the Protestants, commenced to study the Fathers of the Church in the hope of finding the truth. He soon made up his mind to return to the Church, and his good resolution was strengthened and encouraged by his wife Catharine, a Polish princess, and Father *Herbst*, a Jesuit, and confessor to the queen. John at once set himself to the task of bringing about his own reconciliation with the Church, and restoring the Catholic faith to his kingdom; and in this, as in everything else, he showed that unfaltering self-reliance and prudent foresight which are the natural adjuncts of a wise man working in a good cause. He began by promulgating an instrument containing thirteen articles, intended to correct the morals of the clergy, which was closely followed by an order to the aged Archbishop Anderson to publish (1571) certain additions to the ritual, in which he said, among other things, "that the true faith had been announced by Ansgar and other saints of Sweden, and that a knowledge of the writings of the Fathers was necessary to a right understanding of Holy Writ."[2] The Jesuit, Father Herbst, seized the present favourable opportunity to expose the so-called "*Agenda*," or line of conduct of the Swedish Church, and to make known the true Catholic doctrine, which had been shamefully misrepresented and mutilated by the Lutheran and other sectaries. His chief instrument in accomplishing both purposes was the "*Cathechism of Peter Canisius*," which, being a standard exposition of Catholic teaching, he was desirous of having in the hands of everyone. King John, though persuaded of the necessity of making the Catholic faith once more the religion of the land, thought it expedient, and even necessary, that the queen should receive the Blessed Sacrament under both kinds; but *Cardinal Hosius* opposed an unconquerable resistance to any such compromise.[3] Upon the death of the Archbishop of Upsala, the oldest and most formidable advocate of Lutheranism, and of the Bishops of Linkoeping and Westeraes, the king determined to fill these Sees with persons who would accept and carry out his policy. He was encouraged to take more decided measures by *Father Warszewicki*,[4] a clever Jesuit, by whose advice he convoked a Council (1574), which he opened with an address, deploring the sad condition

[1] Chambers' Encyclopæd., art. "*Eric*." (Tr.)
[2] *Theiner*, Pt. I., pp. 348-353.
[3] *Theiner*, Pt. I., p. 363 sq.
[4] Ibid., Pt. I., p. 390 sq.

to which dissensions and divisions had brought the Protestant Church. Finding the clergy not averse to his policy, he appointed *Lawrence Peterson Gothus* to the archiepiscopal see of Upsala, and *Martin* and *Erasmus* to those of Linkoeping and Westeraes respectively. Peterson having pledged himself to put his signature to seventeen articles, wholly Catholic in their nature and tenor, was consecrated according to the Roman rite, at the same time promising the king to employ his offices in gaining the other bishops over by degrees. Shortly afterwards (1576) the king published a *Liturgy*, whose author was probably *Peter Fecht*,[1] his chancellor, and which obtained almost universal acceptance. It was, however, opposed by *Charles, Duke of Södermanland* (who, like his father, hoped to derive some advantage from the profession of Protestantism), on the ground "that he could not permit any change in the religion that had come to him as a heritage from his ancestors; that it was not in his power to put any constraint upon the consciences of his priests, or to force them to give up the teaching of the Gospel, which had been believed and practised in their country for half a century, and had been confirmed with the seal and signature of so many persons."

About this time *Lawrence Nicolai*, a Jesuit, came from Belgium to Sweden, and was appointed by the king to a professorship of theology at Stockholm. In January, 1577, a discussion on the power and authority of the Church, and on the sacrifice of the Mass, took place between *Nicolai* and the professors *Peter Jone* and *Olof Luth*, in which the Jesuit gained a splendid triumph. In consequence, the *Liturgy* was accepted by a Diet and National Council held shortly after, the discussion being the occasion for convoking the latter assembly. Encouraged by these auspicious beginnings, the king deputed Fecht, his chancellor, and the distinguished *Pontus de la Gardie*, who, besides being skilled in statecraft, was an accomplished man of the world, to represent him at the Papal Court. They were instructed to confer with Gregory XIII., the then reigning Pontiff, on the reunion of Sweden with the Catholic Church. Certain conditions, however, were stipulated, the chief of which were that laymen should be allowed to receive Communion under both kinds; that the national language should be used in divine worship; and that priests should be permitted to marry. Fecht was drowned at sea during the voyage. Gregory XIII. sent as his legate to Sweden *Anthony Possevin*,[2] a learned Jesuit, who, after many earnest conferences with King John, finally received his abjuration in 1578. In taking leave of the Papal Legate, the king, deeply moved, said: "In embracing thee, I express my eternal attachment to the Church of Rome." The Congregation, which assembled at Rome to consider the *twelve* concessions demanded by the king, refused to accede to several of

[1] Apud *Münter* (Magazine of the Ch. H. and C. L. of the North, Vol. II., pp. 41-48), falsely attributed to the Jesuits. See *Theiner*, Pt. I., p. 421 sq.

[2] Cf. *Theiner*, Pt. I., p. 457.

them, and, in consequence, an animated controversy, set on foot and kept alive by the German divines, broke out in Sweden concerning the acceptance or rejection of the new Liturgy. The representatives and advocates of the conflicting opinions were called respectively *Philoliturgists* and *Misoliturgists.*

Duke Charles, while in Germany, conferred with the Protestant princes, and requested them to combine with him against his brother John. His young wife, too, being by birth a German, and a Lutheran in religion, very naturally became the patron and protector of the Protestant leaders once she had made Sweden her home. The king, moreover, had the misfortune to be surrounded by a number of subtle and dangerous intriguers.

James Typotius and the wily diplomatist, Pontus de la Gardie, urged the king to insist on having Rome grant his demands. The instructions of the Holy See to *Possevin,* on his return to Sweden in 1579, are outspoken and to the point. "We have done," said the Holy Father, "whatever in us lay to bring back this country to the Catholic Church; but if it please God that the event should be otherwise, we shall stand justified before the Lord, and be obliged to live on as we have for these forty years, without being able to secure the object for which we have longed." John made still another effort to get the Holy See to acquiesce in his demands, but again meeting with fresh refusals, his zeal for the Catholic faith began to grow cold, in spite of all Possevin could do to keep it aglow.

With the death of Queen Catharine (September 16, 1583) vanished the last hopes of restoring the Catholic Church in Sweden. John was not long in forgetting his pious Catholic consort, and at the Diet of Westeraes publicly announced his marriage with the young *Guneila Bjelke*, who in the sequel became the most powerful protector of Protestantism in the kingdom. Her influence over the king, to which *Chytraeus,* the celebrated theologian of Rostock, in a large measure contributed, became very manifest shortly after their marriage. Still the king to the end insisted on the adoption of his Liturgy, and openly quarrelled on the subject with his brother, the Duke Charles, who was aspiring to the supreme government of Sweden; but beyond this he did nothing to forward the interests of the Catholic Church. He died in 1592. *Sigismund III.*, his son and successor, being the last of the Jagellons, was chosen King of Poland on the death of Stephen Bathory. Having been brought up in the Catholic faith, under the tender care of a loving and solicitous mother, he remained steadfast during his life to the lessons he had learned in his youth. Accordingly, when required by the Senators of Sweden, after the death of his mother, to make profession of the Augsburg Confession, as a condition to his succeeding to the throne, he replied: "I do not value an earthly crown *so* highly as to give a heavenly one in exchange for it." He was soon the idol of every Polish heart. *Stanislaus Karnkowsky,* speaking of him in a letter to his father, wrote as follows: "Who does not recognize and admire a special providence

n all the Lord has done through this young and extraordinary king!" In the interval between his falling heir to the throne of Sweden and his arrival in that country, the administration of the government was placed in the hands of his uncle, the Duke Charles, who, using the power and resources at his command to further his own personal interests and ambition, cunningly made his profession of Protestantism a means to enable him to secure the crown. Having convoked a National Council at Upsala (February 25, 1593), composed of the Clergy and Estates of the kingdom and the deputies of the provinces, the duke made them an address, in the course of which he said: "Among the Swedes councils shall no longer be held, as among the Papists, by greasy fellows with shaven crowns."

The courage of the bishops deserted them, and, fawning like vile slaves in the presence of a master, they were servile enough to proclaim publicly that they had made a blunder in accepting the liturgy of King John.

The Council rejected what it was pleased to call the abuses of Catholicity, and declared its acceptance of the Augsburg Confession; prohibited such as refused to profess the Lutheran creed from preaching the Gospel or teaching in the schools; and closed with the following words of triumph: "Henceforth the Swedes shall be of one heart and have but one God;" to which Duke Charles imperiously added: "Sigismund shall never be king if he refuse to make these concessions." When Sigismund returned to ascend the throne left vacant by his father, he made no secret of his devotion to the Catholic Church, and the exasperated Lutheran clergy, who were plotting with Duke Charles for the king's overthrow, avenged themselves by alienating as far as possible the hearts of the people from him. The presence of the Papal Nuncio, *Malaspina*, who accompanied the king, was the occasion and pretext of the most furious attacks upon the person of the latter. Acting upon the impulse of fanatical zeal and brutal insolence, they shortly went the length of telling the king he must not exercise any *public* act of Catholic worship. A Catholic Pole died at Stockholm, and his mortal remains were buried according to the rites of the Catholic Church; upon which *Eric Schepper*, a Lutheran preacher of that city, ascending his pulpit, preached a vehement tirade upon the enormity and turpitude of the act; and, to properly punish the inhabitants for their apathy and remissness in the presence of so flagrant an outrage, put them all under the ban of interdict. So perfidious were the intrigues carried on by Duke Charles, and so numerous and dangerous the plots entered into by him against Sigismund, that the latter had neither the time nor the opportunity to secure to himself that measure of authority to which his *fairness*, his honesty of purpose, and his principles of political and religious tolerance justly entitled him. Nevertheless, before leaving Sweden, he published a number of ordinances designed to promote the peace and prosperity of both Church and State. He intrusted the government of the country during his absence to Duke Charles

and the royal judges. All the privileges and liberties claimed for the established Church of the country were solemnly confirmed; the revenues of both the higher and the inferior clergy were increased; and, finally, the hands of *bishops*[1] and prelates were strengthened in the exercise of their authority (March 16, 1594).

Sigismund was hardly well out of the country when the Lutheran preachers, led on by *Eric Schepper*, again began a violent attack upon him. He was reproached with having performed an idolatrous and papistical deed, because he had on Maunday-Thursday washed the feet of the poor, and the latter, being participants of the crime, were excommunicated and debarred from receiving alms for the future. Duke Charles was, if anything, more indecent than even the preachers in his assaults upon his kinsman and king, whom he held up as a traitor to his country and to the established religion of the land. The Diet of *Süderkoeping* (1595) declared him guilty of high misdemeanors, in that he had bestowed public offices on Catholics, and permitted them the free exercise of their religion; and it was accordingly enacted by this body that anyone refusing within the term of the six weeks next ensuing to make profession of Lutheranism should quit the country, or, failing to do so, should be forcibly expelled by the authorities. It was further provided that no appeals should be made to the king during his absence from the country, and that not he, but Duke Charles, should appoint all public functionaries. A decree was also passed ordering the suppression of the noble *convent of Wadstena*. The plunder of the Church was divided pretty fairly between the duke and the Lutheran clergy, the former appropriating all the estates and the latter the sacred vessels and precious ornaments. Nothing was left undone to insure the triumph of Lutheranism. Did the people protest and make show of resistance? Every such indiscretion was followed by a more furious exhibition of the duke's cruelty.

Sigismund was not without hope that his return to the country (1598) might have the effect of restoring order. He might, had he pleased, have crushed his uncle by having recourse to arms, and thereby establish again his shattered authority; but his aversion to shedding Swedish blood deterred him from taking this extreme measure. Charles, destitute of magnanimity himself, and incapable of appreciating it in others, and ascribing the hasty departure of Sigismund to indecision and weakness of character, called an assembly of the States at *Jonkoeping* (January, 1599), before which he appeared, and accused the king of wishing to again plunge Sweden into the errors of Antichrist. Another assembly, which met at *Stockholm* in May of the same year, passed a resolution releasing the States from

[1] In Sweden, as in Denmark, the office and dignity of *bishops* are merely *nominal*, the so-called Superintendents, though not in Orders, being in every sense their equals. Hence *Münter* (l. c., Vol. I., p. 334) makes the following observation: "The Church of Sweden is wholly in accord with that of Denmark as regards episcopal consecration, which it retains only as a venerable practice of the primitive Church, and in refusing to attach to the episcopal office any of those privileges and prerogatives which the advocates of the episcopal system have been in the habit of considering *as inherent in and flowing from the fact of consecration*."

their oath of allegiance, should the king refuse to grant all their demands, and in particular the one requiring him to place his son Ladislaus in the custody of Duke Charles to be educated; for, it was said, should he continue a Catholic, he would forfeit all hope of the crown of Sweden. Anyone who was either rash or bold enough to express his preference for Sigismund was effectually prevented from repeating the offence by having his head chopped off.[1] Charles forced the States at the Diet of *Linkoeping*, in 1600, to pass a law setting forth that Sigismund and his heirs had forfeited the crown of Sweden, because of his opposition to the true teaching of the Gospel. Many of the subjects of Sigismund, who had long lain in prison in expiation of their fidelity to their prince, and among whom were nine counsellors of State, were given their choice between death and allegiance to an usurper, and they unanimously preferred the former alternative, and died like heroes. On the 22nd of March, 1604, the States again assembled at *Nordkoeping*, and declaring that Sigismund had forfeited the crown, placed it upon the head of Duke Charles.

Concerning the use made of Protestantism by *Gustavus Vasa* and *Charles IX.*, for the purpose of reaching the throne of Sweden, history has long since given her verdict.

§ 328. *Protestantism in Denmark, Norway, and Iceland.*

In *Denmark*,[2] as in the other Northern kingdoms, the political power was divided between the bishops and the nobility. The Bishop of *Röskilde* alone held thirty-three fiefs. As a rule, the bishops were both ignorant and licentious. The king, being elected by the two Estates, each nearly if not quite independent of the crown, and with conflicting interests, had not unfrequently conditions imposed upon him, which, besides being degrading to him as a monarch, could only with difficulty, if at all, be discharged. *Christiern II.* (1513-1523) could ill brook this ascendency, and resolved to humble the aristocratic classes and subvert their power. He took it for granted that Protestantism would be favourable to his designs, because, according to the teachings of Luther, princes might rob bishops of their estates, and strip them of all political influence, and not have their consciences in the least disturbed by a sense of moral obliquity. This prince, who was himself an impure despot and the submissive slave of his paramour's mother, had no purpose in introducing the principles of the Reformation into his kingdom other than to get possession of the wealth of the Church. Believing for the time that the terrible massacre, perpetrated by his orders in Stockholm, had

[1] The periodical "*Sion*" for September, 1841, contains a remarkable letter written from the North, in which the writer speaks of a curious book entitled "*The Beheading Block of Duke Charles.*" About one hundred and forty persons were executed by his orders for offences against the State, or, more definitely, for their allegiance to their lawful king.

[2] Abridgment of the Hist. of the Reformation in Denmark, by *Ericus Pantoppidanus*, Lübeck, 1734. By the *same*, Annales (see Vol. II., p. 167, n. 1). *Münter*, Danske Reform Historie. Kjöbenh., 2 vols., and Ch. H. of Denmark and Norway, Lps. 1834, Vol. III. Cf. *Holberg*, Political History of Denmark and Norway, Copenh., 1731, 4to. *Dahlmann*, Hist. of Denmark and Hamburg, 1841, 3 vols.

been decisive in carrying out his plans in Sweden, he at once began his assault upon the Church in Denmark by handing over the Church of Copenhagen (1520) to a certain *Martin*, a disciple of Luther's, against the united protests of the Estates, the clergy, and the people. But Christiern would suffer no difficulties to stand in his way, and, where other means would not do, menace and the extreme of punishment were employed. Ecclesiastics, who pleased to remain unmarried, besides other disabilities, were forbidden to hold any real estate in their own name, and the Archbishop-elect of Lund was put to death. The despotism was too odious to be borne, and both bishops and barons united in a successful effort to overthrow it. Christiern was succeeded by *Frederic I.*, Duke of Slesvig and Holstein (1523-1533), who, in spite of the fact that he had bound himself by oath at his coronation to maintain the Catholic Church, soon began, from motives similar to those acted upon by his predecessor, to favour Protestantism in secret, and, after a time, openly professed himself a Protestant, and took the Lutheran preacher, *Hans Tausan* (after 1521), under his protection. He defended his line of conduct at the *Diet of Odensee*, in 1527, by saying that he had pledged himself to maintain the Catholic Church, but had not promised to tolerate her abuses. At this Diet he had a measure passed by which the same civil rights were secured to Lutherans as those enjoyed by Catholics, until such time as an Œcumenical Council could convene; but in the interval he was careful to break off all relations with Rome, and to reserve to himself the confirmation of persons appointed to bishoprics. The king summoned a conference on religion at Copenhagen in 1529, but the Catholic bishops, who had been placed in their sees by his favour, being both ignorant and worldly, were, single-handed, no match for their Lutheran adversaries, and they were therefore forced to call to their aid the distinguished Catholic German theologians, *Eck* and *Cochlæus*. These theologians, however, failed to come, and the burden of the defence of the Catholic cause devolved upon *Stagefyr* of Cologne, the only Catholic theologian present. But new difficulties now arose to prevent a discussion. It was necessary, if it was to go on at all, that the disputants should speak Latin, which the Protestant champions peremptorily refused to do. The Catholics, moreover, claimed that the authority of the writings of the Fathers, and of the canons and decrees of Councils should be recognized, while the Protestants would admit no authority other than the Bible. Both parties were therefore under the necessity of putting their claims and grievances in writing, and of presenting them in this form to the king and counsellors of State, who, as might have been anticipated, declared Lutheranism the true and divinely revealed religion of Christ. Open acts of hostility against the Catholics were at once set on foot, in which the city of Malmö took the initiative. *Rönnow*, the Bishop of Röskilde, was forced to pay the king six thousand florins as a gratuity for his pallium.

Upon the death of Frederic, the bishops formally protested

against the succession of his eldest son, *Christiern III.*, who was known to be a personal friend of Luther's; but this prince, fully confident that any aggressive act against the Church would conciliate the good-will of the lay nobility, issued an order for the arrest and imprisonment of all the bishops of Denmark (August 20, 1536), and demanded a surrender of their sees as the price of their freedom. Rönnow, Bishop of Röskilde, steadfastly refused to become a partner to so iniquitous a bargain, and died in prison in 1544, a martyr to his duty and his faith. In 1537, *Bugenhagen* was invited by the king from Wittenberg to complete the work of reformation in Denmark. Having crowned the king, he drew up a form of ecclesiastical organization, according to which every detail of Church government was wholly dependent upon the royal will. In the room of the bishops seven superintendents were appointed, who, after a time resumed the now meaningless title of "*bishops.*" The Diet of *Odensee* (1539) gave its approbation to this ecclesiastical organization, and the Diet of *Copenhagen* (1544) stripped the Catholic Church of all her rights and privileges, and parcelled out her possessions between the king and the nobles. Catholics were disabled from holding office and deprived of their hereditary rights; the Catholic clergy were commanded, under penalty of death, to quit the kingdom, and the same punishment was to be inflicted upon those who might harbour them. Catholics wishing to remain in the country had to make their choice between exile or apostasy.

The Archbishop of Drontheim was largely instrumental in propagating Lutheranism in *Norway.*[1] A faithful adherent of King Christiern II., he was obliged to seek safety in flight upon the fall of that prince, and, quitting his own country, found an asylum in the Netherlands (1537). After the forcible resignation of a second bishop, and the imprisonment of a third, Protestantism was triumphant in the land, and one had either to profess it or be deprived of all rights, religious, political, and social. Numbers of the monks remained steadfast, and went into exile rather than do violence to their consciences. In *Iceland*[2] the first attempts to introduce Lutheranism were firmly resisted by the inhabitants; but, being discouraged by the execution of *John Aresen*, a bishop, they held out for some time longer, and then gradually yielding (after 1551), began little by little to accept the new doctrines, and in the end were quite ready to receive any error that came in their way.

§ 329. *Protestantism in England.*

† Vera et sincera historia schismatis Anglicani a *Nic. Sandero*, aucta per *Ed. Richtonum*, tandem aucta et castigata per *Ribadeneiram*, Colon., 1628. **Læmmer*, Monu-

[1] *Gebhardi*, Hist. of Denmark (33rd part of his Universal History, Halle, 1770, p. 156).

[2] *Harboe*, The Reformation in Iceland (Hist. Mem. of the Scientific Society of Copenhagen, Vols. VI. and VII., Altona, 1796).

menta Vaticana, p. 25 sq., et passim. *Hundeshagen*, Epp. aliquot ineditae Buceri, Calvini, etc., ad hist. eccl. Britan, Bern., 1844. *Burnet*, Hist. of the Ref. of the Church of Engl, Lond., 1679 sq., 2 T. fol.; Oxf., 1816; Lond., 1825, 6 T.; Abridged ed., Brunswick, 1765, 2 vols. †*Dodd's* Church History of England, from the commencement of the sixteenth century to the revolution in 1688, with additions and a continuation by the Rev. *Tierny*, Lond., 1840, 4 vols. *Hume*, Hist. of Great Britain—of Engl., Lond., 1754 sq., 4 vols., and frequently. *Dahlmann*, Hist. of the English Revolution, Lps., 1848. *Gumpach*, Explanations and Amendments of Dahlmann's Hist., Darmstadt, 1845. By the *same*, Separation of the English Church from Rome, Darmstadt, 1845. *Ranke*, English History, especially of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Berlin, 1859 sq., 6 vols. (complete works, Vols. XIV.-XXI.) *Maurenbrecher*, England during the Age of Reformation, Düsseldorf, 1866. †**John Lingard*, History of England, Vols. VI.-XII. Lord *John Russell*, Essay on the English Government and Constitution, 1823; new ed., 1865 (Germ. tr. accord. to the 4th ed., Freiburg, 1873). †*Audin*, Histoire de Henri VIII. et du schisme d'Angleterre, Par., 1850, 2 vols. †*Thommes*, Hist. of England during the Age of the Tudors, Mentz, 1866. *Cobbett*, Hist. of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland, 1824 (Germ., Offenbach, 1828, 3rd ed.). †*Challoner*, Memoirs of the Missionary Priests and other Catholics who suffered death on account of religion in England between A.D. 1577-1684, Derby, 1844, 2 vols., 16mo; the *same*, Philad., 1840, 1 vol. (Germ. ed., 2 vols., Paderborn, 1852). *Boost*, Hist. of the Reformation and Revolution in England, Augs., 1843. Also an able series of articles by *T. W. M. Marshall, LL.D.*, in the *Tablet*, London newspaper, of 1876. (Tr.)

In the course of the religious and political movements which disturbed Europe, questions touching all the relations and phases of society and the family came up for discussion; and the question of marriage,[1] being necessarily among the rest, became the occasion and cause of the religious and political revolution that took place in England.

Henry VIII. succeeded to the throne of England upon the death of his father in 1509, when not quite eighteen years of age, and two months later (June 3) married *Catharine of Aragon*, the widow of his elder brother, *Arthur*, lately deceased. To marry his brother's widow a papal dispensation was necessary, which was granted by Pope Julius II. on Catharine's representation, the truth of which Henry himself afterwards admitted, that her marriage with Arthur had not been consummated.

For seventeen years Henry lived a life of uninterrupted happiness with his queen, who during that time bore him five children, three sons and two daughters, of whom *Mary*, who subsequently ascended the throne, alone survived.

Henry was suddenly stricken with scruples of conscience as to the legality of his marriage, and these were probably quickened and intensified by the fading beauty of Catharine, who was six years his senior, and by the fascinating charms of *Anne Boleyn*, maid-of-honour to the queen, who had won his heart. Henry requested Pope Clement VII. to declare his marriage with Catharine invalid (1527). The Pope issued a commission to Cardinal *Campeggio*, the Papal Legate, and to Cardinal *Wolsey*, Henry's minister, to make the facts upon which the application was based the subject of a judicial examination. The queen, deeming it unbecoming her dignity to have her marriage passed upon by a commission, which was not only composed of the

[1] See p. 229. § 310.

king's subjects,[1] but which, she believed, did not enjoy the freedom necessary to judicial fairness, appeared before the court at Blackfriars only to offer an appeal to the Pope. Clement, unwilling to grant the king's demand, and yet desirous to avoid giving him offence, resorted to various expedients in order to gain time, in the hope that Henry would in the meanwhile return to a better mind. The effect was just the contrary, and every hindrance and delay added to the king's impatience. By the advice of *Cranmer* the question was submitted to the universities of Europe. Those of Oxford and Cambridge declared in favour of the divorce; those of Germany decided against it; and those of France and Italy would not admit of its possibility, unless on the supposition that the queen's former marriage with Arthur had not been consummated.[2] But the end was not yet. The Pope's decision was not forthcoming. Henry was irritated, and in his anger had the payment of the *first-fruits to the Pope abolished.* This measure, which was intended as a menace to Rome, was followed by another, providing that, should the Pope refuse to confirm appointments to episcopal sees made by the crown, the appointees should dispense with such confirmation, and go on and be consecrated.

Henry had been privately married to Anne Boleyn in January, 1533, and it was therefore of the first importance to him that the affair of his divorce should be brought to a speedy issue. Cranmer had been working long and industriously to bring about a complete rupture with Rome, and now that the crisis was come he was found fully prepared to meet it. The clergy were to be won over by threats and punishments. They were declared to have incurred the penalties of *Præmunire* for having unlawfully submitted to the legatine power of Cardinal Wolsey; but at the same time a hint was thrown out that they might expect a plenary pardon if they would consent to recognize the *King as the Supreme Head of the Church in England.* The clergy returned an equivocal answer, saying they were willing to accept his jurisdiction in ecclesiastical affairs, "in so far as they might consistently with the law of Christ," and with this qualified submission the king expressed himself satisfied. But to carry out his ulterior designs he had need of agents more devoted to his interests, and less conscientious as to their own duties. Such was Cranmer. As Henry's envoy on the Continent, he became familiar with the teachings of the Reformers, and, although in Holy Orders, privately married a niece of the famous German divine, Osiander. After Wolsey's disgrace, and on the death of Warham, Cranmer was

[1] Cardinal Campeggio was the incumbent of the See of Salisbury. (Tr.)

[2] "In France the profuse bribery of the English agents would have failed with the University of Paris but for the interference of Francis himself. As shameless an exercise of Henry's own authority was required to wring an approval of his cause from Oxford and Cambridge. In Germany the very Protestants, in the fervour of their moral revival, were dead against the king. So far as could be seen from Cranmer's test [an appeal to the universities. (Tr.)] every learned man in Christendom condemned Henry's cause." —*Greene,* Hist. of the English People, New York, 1876, p. 343. (Tr.)

appointed to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury, and made privy counsellor to the king. One more ready to carry out the royal will and less scrupulous about the means to be employed in doing so could not have been chosen. Previously to taking the oath of fidelity to the Pope, on the day set apart for the ceremony, he withdrew to the chapter-house of St. Stephen's, at Westminster, and there, in the presence of witnesses, protested that in what he was about to do he had no intention of binding himself or laying himself under any sort of obligation to place the least obstacle in the way of the ecclesiastical reforms meditated by the king. This was the first of the series of hypocritical acts that followed.

Fully informed of Henry's marriage to Anne, Cranmer addressed him a letter in April, 1533, begging to know if it were the royal pleasure that the cause of divorce should be heard in his own ecclesiastical court, and, if so, requesting his majesty to submit in advance to the future decision. The king graciously complied with the suggestion of the archbishop, taking occasion, however, to remind his Lord of Canterbury that "the sovereign had no superior on earth, and was not subject to the laws of any earthly creature." The Ecclesiastical Court was opened at Dunstable, and Catharine received three citations to appear before it. Having refused, she was pronounced "verily and manifestly contumacious," and her marriage was declared null and invalid. Cranmer conveyed the result to the king in a letter, in which he gravely exhorts his majesty to submit respectfully to the decisions of the Ecclesiastical Court, and to hasten to escape the censures of the Church, which he would bring upon himself by refusing to break off his incestuous intercourse with the wife of his brother. At another court, held May 28, at Lambeth, Cranmer, "in virtue of his spiritual power and his apostolic jurisdiction," pronounced the marriage of Henry and Anne valid and lawful. The Pope, acting on the almost unanimous opinion of the Sacred College, reversed the decision of Dunstable, and rendered a definitive sentence, declaring the marriage between Henry and Catharine lawful and valid. This decision was the signal for *the rupture with the Holy See*, and it was forthwith proclaimed that the Pope had no longer any jurisdiction in England. It was now the Archbishop of Canterbury who confirmed appointments to bishoprics and granted dispensations; but an appeal might be carried from the archbishop's tribunal to the royal chancery. The king was the Supreme Head of the Church of England, and the source of all spiritual jurisdiction, whether episcopal or papal. The oath of supremacy was imposed upon all, and those refusing to take it were adjudged guilty of high treason. An order was issued enjoining that the Royal Supremacy should be proclaimed from every pulpit, and form part of the teaching of every school in the kingdom. The Pope's name was no longer heard in the land. *Thomas Cranmer*, a layman, was named vicar-general in all matters ecclesiastical, and received from the king plenary spiritual powers. All the bishops were simultaneously

suspended from exercising their functions, and had their jurisdiction and power restored only after they had recognized the Royal Supremacy. In the eighth month after the nuptial ceremony, Anne Boleyn bore to Henry a daughter, who subsequently ascended the throne under the name of Elizabeth. Fearing that the shortness of the interval between the marriage and the birth of the princess might give rise to suspicions touching her legitimacy, and endangering her succession, Henry had an act passed requiring all his subjects to make oath that Elizabeth was the true and lawful heir to the throne.

The *confiscation of ecclesiastical property* next occupied the attention of king and parliament. A commission was appointed by Cromwell to make a general visitation of the religious houses of the kingdom (1535), with a view, as Mr. Hume candidly admits, of discovering such irregularities as might furnish a pretext for their suppression. Parliament, acting upon the report of these commissioners, familiarly called the "*Black Book*," hurriedly passed a bill providing for the suppression of all religious houses whose income was less than two hundred pounds a year, of which there were one hundred and seventy-six, and granting their revenues to the Crown. It was said these were dissolved "*for the glory of Almighty God and the honour of the kingdom*," and because "they happened to be at once the weakest and the worst." (27 Henry VIII., c. 28.)

But the larger monasteries, "in which discipline was better observed," were destined to share the fate of the less considerable and more disorderly.

In the year 1536, there was an uprising of the inhabitants of the northern counties of England to protest against the recent innovations, and particularly against the expulsion of the monks from their monasteries. The insurgents bound themselves by oath to stand by each other "for the love which they bore to Almighty God, His faith, and the Holy Church;" and everywhere along the route of their march, which was called "The Pilgrimage of Grace," they seized the suppressed monasteries, and restored them to the ejected monks. The communities of the larger monastic establishments were now charged with having taken part in this insurrection, and, as a punishment for their complicity, their houses were dissolved and their property confiscated. In the southern counties fair promises and large bribes were held out to the abbots and more considerable personages of the various houses; and when these failed of their purpose, frauds, threats, and violence were resorted to. The work of suppressing the monasteries was completed by an Act of Parliament in 1539, "vesting in the crown all property, movable and immovable, of the monastic establishments, which either had already been or should hereafter be suppressed, abolished, or surrendered."[1] By the year 1540 the work of "secularization" had been completed; the royal will had been carried out with shocking vandalism; works that had cost years of patient and skilful labour, the triumphs of art and the

[1] *Lingard* Hist. of Engl., London, 1847, Vol. VI.

monuments of science, all were destroyed. Nor did the hatred of the ancient faith stop here. The tombs of *St. Augustine*, the Apostle of the Anglo-Saxons, and *St. Thomas à Becket*, martyr to his defence of ecclesiastical immunities, were despoiled, and the ashes they contained flung to the winds. Even the tomb of *King Alfred*, the founder of England's greatness, did not escape the hands of the ravager. From the revenues of the confiscated monastic establishments Henry founded and scantily endowed six bishoprics and fourteen cathedral and collegiate churches; but the bulk of the sacrilegious plunder went to indemnify the royal visitors and the parasites of the court. But, notwithstanding these tyrannical proceedings, Henry had not yet fully made up his mind to *wholly separate* himself from the Catholic Church. "I will strike off," he said, "her *strange* Head with the tiara, but the body I will leave untouched."

In the year 1538, Henry, by a statute, entitled "An Act for Abolishing Diversity of Opinions," ordained that certain doctrines and practices, which were substantially those of the Roman Catholic Church, should be accepted and professed by all his subjects, under the severest penalties. Even the use of holy water and blessed ashes was retained, and the veneration of the saints enjoined. This statute contained what are known as the "*Bloody Six Articles*," in which the doctrines were enumerated, concerning which there was the greatest conflict of opinions. They declared transubstantiation to be necessary to salvation, and clerical celibacy to be of divine command; that private Masses should be retained, and that auricular confession was expedient and necessary. It was further ordained that the severest penalties should be inflicted upon anyone refusing to accept these teachings.[1] Henry permitted the reading of the Bible to all, reminding them, however, that this was not their right, but a favour granted "of the royal liberality and goodness," and that when they should meet passages difficult of interpretation, they should apply to others more learned than themselves.[2] But whatever leniency he might show in other matters, there was one to which no opposition would be tolerated. His spiritual supremacy was sacred, and must be so regarded by all his subjects. For writing against it, *Forest*, confessor to Queen Catharine was burned at the stake; and others, who called it in question, were put to death in various ways. Among the victims of Henry's despotism and cruelty, *Thomas More*, High Chancellor, and *John Fisher*, Bishop of Rochester,[3] were the most illustrious for their position, their learning, their virtues, and the fortitude with which they suffered. Of the latter Henry said on one occasion: "In my opinion, I have never met, in all my travels, anyone to compare in learning and virtue with the Bishop of Rochester." Bishop Fisher refused to acknowledge the king's marriage with Anne Boleyn as "good and lawful," and for this offence he was soon to feel the full weight of the royal vengeance. He was shortly arrested for misprision of treason,

[1] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. VI., p. 293. (Tr.) [2] Ibid., p. 278. (Tr.)
[3] †*Kerker*, John Fisher, Bp. of Rochester and Martyr, Tübg., 1860.

in that he had heard a woman named Elizabeth Barton, better known as the Holy Maid of Kent, say that the king would survive his divorce from Catharine only seven months, and had failed to report the conversation. An oath was presented to him affirming the legality of the king's marriage with Anne, which he declined to take, and was in consequence committed to the Tower, April 26, 1534. He was now close on seventy years of age, but neither his gray hairs nor his past services could move the heart of the royal despot to mercy. He languished in prison for thirteen months, enduring privations the most severe and cruelties the most barbarous; and when he again came forth it was only to appear before a special commission appointed to try him at Westminster, on the charge of high treason, for having refused to make oath that the king was the "Supreme Head of the Church of England." After a hasty trial, he was declared guilty, and beheaded June 22, 1535. In the preceding May he had been created cardinal by Pope Paul III., but, though he may have appreciated the kindness, he had now ceased to put any value on dignities, and declared that, "if the hat were at his feet, he would not stoop to take it up." His head was set up on London-bridge, and his body, after lying naked all day at the place of execution, was carried away by the guards, and laid in the churchyard of All Hallows, Barking.[1]

Thomas More, by his great learning and extraordinary capacity for business, had risen from a comparatively low station to the office of Lord Chancellor of England. Distinguished for his literary ability, his knowledge of law, his winsome manners, and sweetness of temper, he was no less conspicuous for his deep and unaffected piety and his unwavering fidelity to his friends; thus uniting in himself the qualities of a statesman, a scholar, and a Christian. But neither his virtues, his abilities, nor his services could save him from the savage ferocity of Henry. More had refused to approve Henry's divorce from Queen Catharine and his marriage with Anne Boleyn, and for this offence he, like Bishop Fisher, was committed to the Tower, and, like him, too, brought forth again only to be arraigned before the commission at Westminster on the charge of high treason, for having denied the king to be the Supreme Head of the Church of England. As soon as the indictment had been read, More was told that he might still enjoy the king's favour by abjuring his former opinions. The offer was promptly declined, and the prisoner was declared guilty and condemned to death. He met death with the same vivacious cheerfulness and unfaltering courage that had distinguished him through life, professing with his last breath that he died a true Catholic before God. He was beheaded in the Tower, July 6, 1535.[2]

[1] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. VI., pp. 220-221. (Tr.)

[2] Thomæ Mori opera, Lovanii, 1566. Thomas More, Represented according to Authentic Sources, by *Dr. Rudhart*, Nürnberg, 1829. Sir Thomas More: His Life and Times, by *W. J. Walter*, London, 1840. *Thommes*, Thomas More, Augsburg, 1847.

Cardinal Reginald Pole was equally the object of Henry's[1] vindictive cruelty. Having completed his education abroad, he returned to England in 1525, where the highest ecclesiastical dignities were awaiting his acceptance. About this time the king was meditating his divorce from Catharine, which Pole not only opposed, but still further incensed Henry by the publication of his treatise, "*De Unitate Ecclesiastica.*" His pension and all his preferments were withdrawn, and preparations were being made for his impeachment, when he eluded the king's vengeance by escaping to the Continent. The Pope rewarded his courage and constancy by raising him to the cardinalate. He was sent as Legate to France and the Low Countries in 1537, when Henry in vain demanded his extradition from the governments of these countries.

Failing to avenge himself on Pole, the king had his mother, the aged Countess of Salisbury, and others of the obnoxious cardinal's relations arrested, tried upon fictitious charges, and put to death. The Countess of Salisbury was the nearest of kin to Henry of all his blood relations; was the last in the direct line of the Plantagenets, who had ruled England for so many generations; and both in prison and with her head upon the block showed a dignity and courage worthy her royal descent. She was beheaded, May 21, 1541, repeating the words of our Lord, "Blessed are they who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake."

Thomas Cromwell, who had been chiefly instrumental in shedding so much blood, was himself to be judged by the bloody laws he had made, and in virtue of which so many noble victims fell. Henry had never quite forgiven him for his share in negotiating the marriage with that unlovely woman, Anne of Cleves, who contributed so much to disturb the king's domestic happiness. He was arrested on the 10th of June, 1540, and cast into prison. He was accused of malversation in the discharge of his office of chancellor; of holding heretical opinions and protecting heretics; and, finally, of treason, in that he had expressed his readiness to fight against the king, if it were necessary, in defence of his religious opinions. He demanded a public trial, and to be confronted with his accusers, but the justice which he had denied to so many others was now refused to himself. A bill of attainder was drawn up against him, and passed both houses of parliament without a dissentient voice. On the 28th of July following he was beheaded on Tower Hill. Stern and unrelenting during life, he was craven and cowardly at the hour of death.

Henry was as atrociously cruel to his wives as he was to his ministers and other subjects of inferior degree. Catharine of Aragon survived her repudiation a little less than three years, dying a most exemplary death, January 8, 1536. She was hardly laid in her grave, when Anne Boleyn, who had taken her place in her husband's affec-

[1] Cf. Vol. III. of New Series of Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, London, 1869. See *Reumont*, in the Bonn Theological Review, 1870, nros. 25 and 26.

tions, and was the cause of all her misfortunes, was tried on the charges of adultery, incest, and high treason, declared guilty, and beheaded on the green within the Tower, May 19, 1536. Cranmer, who had formerly, "in virtue of his apostolic authority," pronounced the marriage between Henry and Anne lawful and valid, was now called upon to reverse his former decision, and, "*in the name of Christ and for the glory of God*," declared that the same marriage was and always had been null and void." On the day of Anne's execution, as if to express his contempt for her memory, Henry dressed himself in a suit of white, and on the following morning was married to *Jane Seymour*, who died (October 24, 1537) in less than a fortnight after giving birth to a male child, subsequently known as Edward VI. Henry was next married to *Anne of Cleves* in the beginning of the year 1540. The marriage was a political one, brought about through the agency of Thomas Cromwell, who hoped to strengthen the Protestant cause in England and prop up his own power through the influence of the new queen, who was known to be a thorough-going Lutheran. Deceived as to her beauty and personal attractions, Henry married her only because he could not well help himself, and, after living with her six months, procured a divorce mainly on these grounds (July 13). Within a month (August 8) he married *Catharine Howard*, who, being shortly after charged with having committed adultery, was pronounced guilty, and beheaded February 13, 1541. Henry's sixth and last wife, *Catharine Parr*, was on one occasion nearly losing her head for venturing to differ on theological questions with the Head of the Church of England; but quickly detecting her mistake, she escaped the royal vengeance by adroitly flattering his great wisdom and theological learning, expressing her most humble submission to his judgment, and professing that in differing from him she had only desired to draw him into a heated discussion, because when animated, he seemed to forget the pain of the malady from from which he was suffering. By this clever expedient, Catharine kept her head on her shoulders, and had the good fortune to outlive the brutal monster, who died in 1547.

Henry reigned for thirty-eight years, and during that time he ordered the execution of two queens, two cardinals, two archbishops, eighteen bishops, thirteen abbots, five hundred priors and monks, thirty-eight doctors of divinity and laws, twelve dukes and earls, one hundred and sixty-four gentlemen, one hundred and twenty-four commoners, and one hundred and ten ladies.

Edward VI., who was only ten years of age at the death of his father, succeeded to the throne of England; but by an article in the last will and testament of Henry sixteen individuals were named to exercise the authority of the Crown until the young prince should have completed his eighteenth year. This arrangement was broken through by Edward Seymour, the young king's uncle, then Earl of Hereford and afterwards *Duke of Somerset*, who was ardently attached to the principles of the Reformation. He succeeded in having himself appointed

Protector of the realm and guardian of the king's person. The king renewed the authority of Cranmer, and parliament withdrew from the chapters the right of electing bishops. All pretence of observing Catholic forms, so much insisted on during his lifetime by Henry, was now cast aside, and tokens of *apostasy* were everywhere visible. The Mass was abolished, the marriage of priests authorised, and the use of the vulgar tongue in public worship introduced. Images, statues, sacred ornaments, altars, private chapels,—in short, whatever served to preserve or revive the remembrance of the ancient faith, were either destroyed or put out of sight. Refractory bishops were deposed, and their goods confiscated.

In the year 1547 a *Book of Homilies* was published, with the double purpose of supplying the want of sermons and securing uniformity of belief. This was followed in the succeeding year by a *Catechism*, the work of Cranmer, the object of which was set forth to be "for the singular profit and instruction of children and young people." Shortly after, Cranmer, "by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost," and with the assistance of Ridley and eleven other divines, began the composition, or rather compilation, of a liturgy or service-book in the English tongue, and for the use of the English Church. Taking as their pattern and guide the Roman Catholic missal and breviary, and omitting whatever they conceived to be either superfluous or superstitious, they completed a work containing offices for the various Sundays and holidays, forms for the administration of the Sacraments, service for the dead, and whatever else was necessary to the public worship of the new Church. This is known as *The First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.* In January, 1549, the king drew the attention of both houses of parliament to it, by whom its use was made obligatory on all ministers of the Church within the realm of England after the ensuing Pentecost, and the use of any other was forbidden under severe penalties. The "*Church Established by Law*," was definitely fixed upon the English people by the aid of foreign and mercenary troops. The effects of suppressing the monastic establishments became now apparent. The poor, who had been in the habit of receiving abundant alms from the wealth of the Church, were now the objects of harsh legislation. Beggars were forbidden to solicit alms, and, if they persisted in doing so, they were cast into prison, and a mark of infamy set upon them by branding them on their foreheads and breasts with red-hot iron. The Duke of Somerset, fearing the ambitious designs of his younger brother, Sir Thomas Seymour, and, it is said, at the instigation of Cranmer, had him arrested, tried on the charge of high treason for plotting to get possession of the young king's person, and meditating a change of government, and executed March 20, 1549. In less than three years the Duke of Somerset himself fell a victim to the jealousy and vindictiveness of his rival, the Earl of Warwick, lately created Duke of Northumberland. He was accused of having meditated the assassination of Northumberland and two other noblemen, declared guilty

of felony, and beheaded, January 22, 1552. He was succeeded, after his first arrest, in the latter part of 1549, in the office of Protector by *John Dudley*, Earl of Warwick,[1] who, judging from his dying declaration, was certainly a Catholic, though he never took any measures to re-establish the ancient faith. It was now found that the Book of Common Prayer, which had been compiled by Cranmer and others, "under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost," about three years before, contained some errors, which it was necessary to correct. It was accordingly revised and amended by Cranmer, assisted by *Bucer* and *Peter Martyr*, and, in its altered form, approved by Convocation and sanctioned by both houses of parliament (1552). The bishops were authorized by statute to punish with spiritual censures, and the magistrates with corporal penalties, all who should introduce or use a different service. Anyone attending a form of worship other than that prescribed in the Liturgy of the Church of England was condemned to imprisonment for a term of six months for the first offence, twelve months for the second, and during his natural life for the third. This is known as *The Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.* It was also ascertained that the "*Six Bloody Articles*" of Henry VIII. were now by no means faithful expositions of the belief of the English Church, and Cranmer received orders to frame others which should adequately express it, and be recognized by all as the standard of orthodoxy. After consultation with his friends, the archbishop drew up a formula of belief, known as "*The Forty-two Articles*," had it approved by a committee of bishops and divines, sanctioned by the king, and subscribed by all church wardens, schoolmasters, and clergymen.[2] These *Articles*, however, were never ratified by parliament; nor is there any proof, except the printed title, that they ever received the sanction of Convocation.[3]

To perfect the organization of the Church of England, a body of ecclesiastical law was still necessary. This had been under consideration during the reign of Henry VIII., but was not carried into effect until the reign of Edward VI., when an act was passed empowering the king to give the force of law to any ecclesiastical regulations framed by a commission of thirty-two, taken in equal number from the spiritual and lay estates of the realm. To avoid inconvenience and unnecessary complication, the duty was delegated to a sub-committee of eight persons, with Cranmer at their head. This committee drew up a body of ecclesiastical law under the title of "*Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*," in fifty-one articles, which, though not published, in consequence of the premature death of the king (July 6, 1553), are interesting as giving the views of the English reformers on many questions of vital importance.[4]

[1] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. VII. (Tr.)

[2] These articles are given in *Burnet*, Vol. II., and in *Salig's* Hist. of the Augsberg Confession, Vol. II.

[3] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. VII., pp. 90-92. (Tr.)

[4] The following points relating to marriage are interesting, and might be referred to as high authority for some of the decisions delivered in our own divorce courts: "The

Cranmer had decided, and parliament had confirmed the decision, that Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon and that with Anne Boleyn were both invalid; and, as a consequence, neither Mary, the issue of the former, nor Elizabeth, the issue of the latter, could succeed to the throne. Hence the Protector, who was conspiring to secure the succession to his own family, brought about a marriage between his son, Lord Guilford Dudley, and *Lady Jane Grey*, daughter of the Duchess of Suffolk, and grand-daughter of Mary, the sister of Henry VIII.

The Duke of Northumberland, who exercised unlimited control over the mind of the dying king, Edward, represented to him the dangers which would follow to the Protestant faith should Mary succeed to the throne, and persuaded him to sign a document entailing the Crown on Lady Jane Grey and her heirs male. To this measure the Lords of the Council reluctantly gave their assent. Edward expired at Greenwich July 6, 1553, and, four days later, Lady Jane Grey was proclaimed queen. The ambition of Northumberland was now apparent. A few days later, at the head of thirty thousand men, who had flocked to her standard from pure motives of loyalty, *Mary* entered London amid the joyful acclamations of the people (July 31), and was crowned by Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, September 30th. The Protector was at once arrested, tried, found guilty of high treason, and decapitated, professing before his execution that he died in the faith of his fathers. In the beginning of the following year, Lady Jane Grey and her husband were also tried and executed: he on Tower Hill; she, because of her royal descent, on the green within the Tower.

Queen Mary earnestly desired to see the ancient faith again the religion of England, and to this end a bill was introduced into parliament towards the close of the year 1553, providing that all religious innovations should be abolished, and that ecclesiastical affairs should be restored to the condition in which they were in the first year of the reign of Henry VIII. Such a measure would have compelled the surrender of all church property confiscated during the last two reigns, and now divided up among the wealthy families of the kingdom, who, having no intention to part with their spoil, opposed and caused the withdrawal of the bill. This was effected by the queen's proroguing parliament. In the next session, opened three days later, a modified bill was introduced, in which all men-

marriage of minors, without the consent of their parents or guardians, and of all persons whomsoever, without the previous publication of banns, or the entire performance of the ceremony in the Church according to the Book of Common Prayer, are pronounced of no effect. . . . Divorces are allowed, not only on account of adultery, but also of desertion, long absence, cruel treatment, and danger to health or life: in all which cases the innocent party is permitted to marry again, the guilty condemned to perpetual exile or imprisonment. To these five cases is added confirmed incompatibility of temper; but this, though it may justify a separation, does not allow either party the privilege of contracting another marriage."—*Lingard's* History of England, London, 1848, Vol. VII., pp 93-94. (Tr.)

tion of the Pope's Supremacy and the alienation of church property was carefully omitted, and the restoration of religion to its condition at the accession of Edward proposed. The bill passed both houses, thus levelling at a blow the great structure that had been built up with so much care and labour by Cranmer and his associates.

In the following year, Cardinal Pole came as Papal Legate to England, and, after thanking the Lords and Commons for having repealed his attainder, expressed the hope that they would likewise repeal all statutes hostile to the Pope's jurisdiction, and his willingness and ability to do whatever might be necessary to bring about a complete reconciliation between England and the Holy See. The motion for a union with Rome was carried in both houses almost by acclamation. The Pope's supremacy in eclesiastical affairs was recognized, the Sacrifice of the Mass was restored, clerical celibacy enjoined, and married priests deprived of their cures. The Protestant bishops, who professed to derive their authority and jurisdiction immediately from the Crown, were now, consistently with their own principles, deposed, and Catholic prelates appointed in their room.

Cardinal Pole absolved "the whole nation and the dominions thereof . . . of all judgments and penalties" incurred on account of heresy and schism, after which a *Te Deum* was sung in thanksgiving for the happy issue of affairs. It was the intention of Cardinal Pole to effect the restoration of the ancient faith by *pacific* means, and to stem the tide of apostasy by the labours of a learned and pious clergy, the importance of whose instruction and training he was constantly and earnestly urging. Mary, unfortunately, did not share these wise and moderate views, obstinately insisting that heretics should be punished with death; and to this end, besides the laws already existing and in force in the two preceding reigns, making heresy a capital offence, revived others formerly enacted for the suppression of the Lollards. But, while it must be frankly admitted that the rigour exercised during this reign in punishing heretics was excessive, on the other hand it cannot be said, in view of the atrocities perpetrated during preceding and subsequent reigns, that Mary merits the distinctive appellation of "*Bloody*." Neither were her acts of cruelty wholly without excuse.

The proclamation of Lady Jane Grey as queen was urged ostensibly on the specific ground that Mary was a Catholic; and her religious opponents uniformly supported, if they did not inspire, every tumult, sedition, and revolt excited against her. Moreover, of the two hundred and seventy-nine persons executed during her reign, many, like *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, were contemptible miscreants; while others, like *Latimer* were perfidious knaves. Cranmer, who had been making decisions in the fulness of his authority during his whole life, and reversing them again at the bidding of an incontinent king; composing prayer-books "under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost;" and. at the suggestion of such reformers as Bucer and Peter Martyr,

correcting the errors which the Holy Ghost had permitted him to insert; signing articles of faith under Henry VIII., and rejecting them again as false under Edward VI.; went on asserting and denying, as suited his interest or convenience, till the last hour of his life. In the hope of saving his life, he signed no fewer than six retractations, and on each occasion vehemently professed his attachment to the Catholic faith; but, finding that these availed not to secure his pardon, he recalled them all at the moment of execution, and faced death (March 21, 1556) with a courage that must be admired, if the cause in which he suffered cannot be approved.

After the death of Mary, in 1558, everything conspired to forward the interests of Protestantism, and to identify them with those of *Elizabeth*.[1] For Elizabeth to remain a Catholic was all one with proclaiming her mother an adulteress, her own birth illegitimate, and, as a consequence, her eligibility to the throne impossible. If her claims were to be supported at all, they must be supported by the Protestants. Besides religious, there were also political considerations in her favour. By her exclusion, the English Crown would have been the right of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland, and great-grand-daughter of Henry VII. Mary had married the Dauphin of France with the express stipulation that, should she die without issue, her right, not only to the throne of Scotland, but also to that of England, should pass to the King of France, thus making England a dependency of the French Crown. The very thought of England passing under the dominion of a foreign prince was revolting to English pride; and the feelings of indignation with which the country at large contemplated such a contingency, were greatly intensified by the fact that the relations of the English Government, at this time, with those of Scotland and France were the reverse of friendly. Animated by such feelings, and swayed by such motives, the English people permitted Elizabeth to ascend the throne without opposition. During the reign of Mary, Elizabeth had frequently made public profession of the Catholic faith, and expressed her sincere attachment to the Catholic Church. After her accession she had been crowned according to the Catholic ritual, by a Catholic bishop, and had sworn to maintain the Catholic religion; but, notwithstanding her professions, her conformity, and her solemn pledges, she was hardly seated upon the throne before she declared openly in favour of Protestantism.

By the advice of *Sir William Cecil*, the English ambassador at the Court of Rome was recalled; the Protestants exiled during the preceding reign permitted to return and appear openly at court; and both houses of parliament filled with ardent partisans of the new faith. Parliament assembled in the early part of the year 1559; revived the statutes of Henry VIII. against Papal authority, and those of Edward VI. in favour of the Reformed service; bestowed the

[1] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. I. and III.; and *Hefele*, Isabella of Spain and Elizabeth of England, being a historical parallel (Cardinal Ximenes, p. 89-101).

tithes and annats upon the queen, and once more invested royalty with ecclesiastical *Supremacy*. It was further enacted that all clergymen taking orders or holding livings; all magistrates and inferior functionaries receiving salaries or fees from the Crown; and all laymen suing out the livery of their lands, or about to do homage to the queen, should take an oath declaring her supreme in ecclesiastical and spiritual affairs, under penalty of deprivation and incapacity; and that anyone asserting the Pope's authority within the realm should, for the second offence, forfeit his property, real and personal, and, if contumacious, be condemned to perpetual imprisonment and death, as in cases of high treason.[1]

Of all the prelates who had held office under Mary, one alone, the Bishop of Landaff, who consented to take the oath of Supremacy, was permitted to retain his see. The other sees were filled by men who had either gone into exile on the Continent, or were conspicuous at home for their attachment to the new faith. Among these the most distinguished was *Matthew Parker*, formerly chaplain to Anne Boleyn, whom Elizabeth now rewarded by appointing him to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. He was consecrated by Barlow, the deprived Bishop of Bath, who had lately embraced the reformed teachings, and having been appointed to the See of Chichester, assisted Parker in consecrating the other newly-created bishops.[2]

In the year 1560 the *Book of Common Prayer* was again revised, a few alterations introduced, and it was provided that, in the absence of clergymen, laymen, and even artisans, might recite the prayers.

[1] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. VII., pp. 259-260. (Tr.)

[2] Ibid., pp. 262-263. (Tr.)

† The question touching the validity of the consecration of these Anglican bishops, and, as a consequence, the validity of all Anglican ordinations, has been frequently discussed. It was at first objected that *Barlow*, the consecrator of Parker, had not himself been consecrated according to the ritual of the Roman Pontifical; but this objection, being regarded by some as not decisive, another, still stronger, drawn from the *formula of consecration*, contained in the Ordinal of Edward VI., the one used in the consecration of Parker, was more confidently urged. The formula ran as follows: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember to stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands." It will be seen that these words have no direct bearing on the purpose for which they were used; contain no reference to the *office and authority of a bishop;* and might therefore be used with equal propriety in the baptism or confirmation of children. They have no specific meaning limiting their application to the consecration of bishops. To remedy this defect, the formula was changed by convocation in the year 1662, under Charles II., and made to read as follows: "*Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* And remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is given thee by this imposition of our hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness." Archbishop *Kenrick* (The Validity of Anglican Ordinations, Phil., 1848, p. 197) remarks "that such a change, made in such circumstances, is equivalent to a tacit avowal of the insufficiency of the form which had been used during the first century of the Anglican Church." If, therefore, the form contained in the Ordinal of Edward VI., and used in the consecration of all bishops during the reign of Elizabeth, was not adequate to validly confer episcopal consecration, it follows that all subsequent ordinations were also necessarily invalid. But Elizabeth *supplied any defects* of the ritual. *Harduin, S. J.*, Dissertation du Père le Courayer sur la succession des évesques anglais et sur la validité de leur ordinations, Paris, 1714, 2 vols.

In the fourth year of Elizabeth's reign (1563), Convocation, presided over by Archbishop Parker, again examined and revised the *Forty-two Articles* of Edward VI., which, it will be remembered, were mainly the production of *Cranmer*. The Articles being the standard and test of orthodoxy in the English Church, it was essential they should set forth the exact creed of that body. After mature consideration, some of the Articles of Edward VI. were dropped, and others substituted in their room; and some were mended by additions or changes of phraseology, the result being the instrument now known as the *Thirty-nine Articles*. By this instrument, in which some changes were again made in 1571, the spiritual supremacy of the Pope was denied; the Sacrifice of the Mass, which was termed "a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit," was abolished; the Catholic doctrines of transubstantiation and purgatory rejected; and the according of reverence to relics and images, and the invocation of saints, reprobated. Of the seven Sacraments, *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, taken under both kinds, were alone retained; *Holy Scripture* was declared to contain everything necessary to salvation, and to be the sole rule of faith (Art. VI.); but it was added (Art. XXXIII.) that anyone who, "through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break *the traditions and ceremonies of the Church*, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, ought to be rebuked openly, as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church." By Article XXXV., it was decreed that the Ordinal of Edward VI. "contained all things necessary *to the consecration of archbishops and bishops* and the ordering of priests and deacons;" and it was added, "whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the rites of that book, or hereafter shall be," are to be "reputed as rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered." [1]

It will be seen that in recognising a *hierarchy of three orders of clergy as an essential element* in its constitution, the Anglican Church differed widely from every other sect of Protestantism. Finally, the Anglican Church retained, with some changes, the ancient *ecclesiastical ritual*, as given in the missals of the Roman Catholic Church; also *the sign of the Cross*, *sacred vestments*, and even attempted to arrogate to itself the name of *Catholic*.

It was not long before the *Established Church* encountered opposition from a certain class of its own members, known in history as *Nonconformists* or *Puritans*. Professing to be followers of the "*pure word of God*," in contradistinction to whatever was of human origin or tradition, they contended that the Anglican Church, by the use of its *Liturgy*, ceremonies, and discipline, too nearly resembled the Church

[1] *Hardwick*, Hist. of the Arts. of Religion, London, 1859, where the Articles of 1553-1563 and 1571 are given in Appendix III. (Tr.)

They are found in Latin in *Augusti*, Corp. libror. symbolicor, pp. 126-142 (Germ. in *Bonn Review*, new series, year V., n. 1, pp. 196-208; *Freiburg Periodical*, Vol. XII., pp. 250-261). Cf. the art. "*High-Church*," in the *Freiburg Cyclop.*, and in the Voices (*Stimmen*) of Maria Laach.

of Rome, and that the line of distinction between the two should be more boldly drawn and more sharply defined.

All were willing to recognise the supremacy of the queen, if for no other reason, because they regarded such a recognition as a protest against the Pope. On this one point all were in perfect accord; but on others there was a wide divergence of opinion. Some were willing to accept the *Liturgy*, ceremonies and discipline, provided these were revised and pruned of whatever savoured too much of papistry; others, who regarded bishops as the servile agents of the Crown, and hated them on account of their aristocratic tastes and tendencies, wished to abolish the Episcopacy altogether, and substitute *Presbyterianism;* and still others, who were equally hostile to both the Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, assumed the attitude and professed the principles of thoroughgoing *Dissenters*.

Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, after a series of misfortunes, abdicated the Crown, under compulsion, in favour of her son. She was then a prisoner in the castle of *Lochleven*, but having made her escape she revoked her act of abdication, and again assumed the style and authority of a sovereign. An army of loyal and trusty followers at once enrolled themselves under her standard, but they were no match either in numbers or discipline for the experienced soldiers of the regent, Murray, by whom they were defeated in the battle of Langside, May 13, 1568. After this disaster, Mary fled hastily across the border into England, and, against the advice and in spite of the remonstrances of her friends, sought the hospitality and protection of Elizabeth, by whom she was detained a prisoner during the remainder of her days. An attempt, made in November, 1569, by the Catholic gentlemen of the northern counties to liberate the royal captive, was promptly put down, and hundreds of the insurgents executed. The only effect of the uprising was to intensify the hatred of Elizabeth for her Catholic subjects. In the following year the queen was still further exasperated by the publication of the bull of Pius V., declaring her cut off from the communion of the Church, her crown forfeited, and absolving her subjects from their allegiance. The condition of the Catholics of England became now almost intolerable. To receive or obey a papal bull or brief of any character whatever, or to deny the spiritual supremacy of the queen, was declared high treason; to refuse to attend Protestant worship ("*recusancy*") was punished with fines, imprisonment, and bodily chastisements; and a body of inquisitors was appointed, who, penetrating into the privacy of families, made search for and seized any papers that might throw a shade of suspicion upon the loyalty or the orthodoxy of their possessors, and were on the alert to catch any unguarded word or expression that might be tortured into an evidence of guilt.

It was hoped that these measures would soon rid England of the presence of Catholic priests, and that in their absence the Catholic religion would wholly perish from the land. This, however, was prevented by the foresight of *William Allen*, a Catholic priest, descended

from an ancient Lancashire family, and formerly principal of St. Mary's Hall, at Oxford, who, in 1568, established a seminary at Douay, in Flanders, for the education of Catholic clergymen destined for the English mission. This seminary, which, in the course of five years, sent nearly one hundred priests across to England, was in 1578 transferred to Rheims, to be out of reach of the harassing persecutions of Elizabeth, but was again re-established at Douay in 1593.

The severest measures of the law were employed to free the country from the presence of such priests as were already there and to deter others from entering it. The penalty of death was pronounced against all priests coming into England, and a like penalty against those who should either afford priests an asylum or go to confession to them. To ordain a priest in England was also declared an offence, punishable with death, and all priests in the kingdom, several of whom were executed, were ordered to quit it within forty days (1584).

Several attempts had been set on foot for the liberation of the Queen of Scots, all of which had been detected and frustrated by the vigilance and energy of the English Government, and, after nearly nineteen years of imprisonment, Mary learned that her fate was decided. She was removed to the castle of Fotheringhay, where she was put on trial (October 11, 1586) before a commission appointed for that purpose, charged with having conspired with foreigners for the double purpose of the invasion of the kingdom and the murder of the queen. The evidence against her purported to be copies of letters addressed by her to Babington, who had been some time previously executed for the same offence; but neither were the originals produced nor was there any satisfactory account given of how the copies came into the hands of the commission.[1] After a short consultation, the commission adjourned to meet in the Star Chamber, at Westminster, on October 25th, when Mary, who was still in prison at Fotheringhay, was declared guilty of the crimes laid to her charge, and her execution demanded by parliament.

Elizabeth for a time dissembled her real feelings, apparently unwilling to shed the blood of her kinswoman, and in the hope that some of those who were so profuse in professions of loyalty to the Crown and attachment to her person would spare her the ignominy of authorising so infamous a deed. But on one point she had her mind fully made up: Mary *must* die; and if it became necessary to take the responsibility of her execution upon herself, she would do so. Accordingly, she signed the death-warrant, February 1, 1587, and seven days later the unfortunate Mary Stuart ascended the scaffold, and placing her head upon the block, died with the dignity of a queen and the constancy of a martyr, professing to the last her firm belief in the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. She had asked as a last request that she might have the services of a Catholic priest in preparing herself for death, but this the commis-

[1] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. VIII., pp. 220-250. (Tr.)

sioners sternly refused, adding, with brutal insolence, that to grant it would be to offend against the law of God and imperil their own souls. However, Mary was not without spiritual comfort in her last moments, for a Host, which had been consecrated by Pope Pius V., was secretly conveyed to her, despite the watchfulness of her persecutors. The executioner, lifting up the head he had just struck off, cried out: "God save Queen Elizabeth;" to which the fanatical Earl of Kent added: "So perish all the enemies of the Gospel:" a speech which plainly laid open the true motives that had inspired the bloody deed.

But the violent hatred of their religion and vindictive persecution of themselves did not crush out in the bosom of Catholics the sentiments of patriotism and loyalty to the Crown, and when either the honour or the interests of England were at stake, they were among the first to rush to her defence. When the "invincible armada" of Philip II. threatened the shores of England, Catholics answered the call of the queen no less promptly that their Protestant fellow-countrymen, with whom they stood shoulder to shoulder, ready to repel the hostile invaders. But neither their patriotism nor their loyalty availed to obtain a mitigation of the horrors they were suffering. They continued all the same to be imprisoned, fined, tortured, hung, and quartered.

Elizabeth died in 1603, and was succeeded by the only son of Mary, Queen of Scots, and Lord Henry Darnley, *James I.* of England (1603-1625) and *VI.* of Scotland (1567-1625). On his elevation, the Catholics indulged the hope that they would now obtain some alleviation of their hardships, and it may be that James was disposed to treat them with clemency, if not with favour, but he dared not face the strong tide of public opinion that had set in against him. The fanaticism of the Puritans, who accused the king of favouring the enemies and persecuting the disciples of the Gospel, led to the revival of the penal law against *recusants*. The statutes of Elizabeth were again enforced, and the king, besides entering the Star Chamber and professing his detestation of Popery, issued a proclamation, banishing all Catholic missionaries from the land, and commanding all magistrates to see to it that the penal laws were put into immediate execution (1604). These persecutions, increasing in severity as time went on, at length led a number of bold, reckless, and misguided men, of whom Guy Fawkes has obtained the most permanent notoriety, to form the famous *Gunpowder Plot*, by which it was designed to blow up the king and the members of both houses of parliament. The mine was to have been fired on the meeting of parliament, towards the close of 1605; but the plot was fortunately discovered in time to prevent the perpetration of so monstrous and inhuman a crime. The conspirators were apprehended and executed; and among those to whose execution the Gunpowder Treason gave occasion, were a number of missionary priests, who had not the slightest knowledge of its existence, and *Father Garnet*, the Provincial

of the Jesuits, whose only offence appears to have been an unwillingness to reveal what had been entrusted to him under seal of confession.[1]

The conspiracy furnished a pretext for fresh enactments against Catholics, more cruel and sanguinary than any that had yet disgraced English legislation. Because *thirteen* individuals had formed a diabolical plot for the destruction of those at whose hands some of them had suffered exceptional outrages, the whole Catholic body must be made to suffer the punishment of their guilt. A new penal code was drawn up by the concurrent action of both houses of parliament, and received the royal assent, May 27, 1606. It ordained that Catholics should not dwell within ten miles of London, or go more than five miles from their homes without written leave from the neighbouring magistrate; that they should be excluded from all civil offices and the learned professions; that husband and wife, unless married by a Protestant minister, could not derive the benefit which otherwise the one would be entitled to from the property of the other; and that if they failed to have a child baptized by a Protestant minister within a month after its birth, they should pay a fine of one hundred pounds; that every child sent to be educated on the Continent should be legally incapacitated from receiving inheritance or other devises until he should have conformed to the Established Church, refusing to do which his rights should pass to the Protestant next-of-kin; that every recusant should be regarded by the law as one excommunicated by name, and, in consequence, his house might be searched, and his books and furniture, if thought to have any connection with his religion, might be burned, and his horses and arms taken from him; and, finally, that as a punishment for absence from the Established Worship, the king might, in his discretion, take either a fine of twenty pounds per lunar month, or all the personal property and two-thirds of the real estate of the recusant. A new oath of allegiance was prescribed, in which a distinction was drawn between those who admitted and those who denied the temporal claims of the Pope. The latter were subject only to the above penalties, and the former, in addition to these, were liable to perpetual imprisonment, confiscation of their personal property, and forfeiture during life of the revenue derived from their lands; but, if married women, they were to be confined in a common gaol until they would consent to take the oath. To avoid taking this oath, and escape the penalties of their refusal, hundreds of Catholics crossed the Channel, and took up their residence on the Continent.[2] To perpetuate the remembrance of the Plot, and to keep alive and active the odium which attached to Catholics, in consequence of the atrocious wickedness of a few of their number, it was ordered that the 5th of November, the day of the

[1] See *Scavini*, Theol. Mor. Univ., ed. Mediolan., 1860, Vol. III., p. 440. (Tr.)
[2] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. IX., pp. 21-74. (Tr.)

discovery of the treason, should be annually commemorated with unusual pomp,[1] and that a prayer should be inserted in the Liturgy imploring protection against "*cruel and bloodthirsty enemies.*"

The development of the principles of Protestantism in Scotland was the reverse of that which they assumed in England; for, while they led to the absolutism of the Crown in the latter country, in the former they issued in the assertion of the *supremacy of the people.*

James, who was constantly repeating the maxim, "No bishop, no king," was anxious to preserve the episcopacy, believing it to be the firmest support of the throne; but, on the other hand, he hesitated to do justice to Catholics, fearing to bring upon himself the full fury of Presbyterian fanaticism. But the storm, which he dreaded to evoke, and succeeded in holding in check for a season, broke forth with terrific violence during the reign of his successor, *Charles I.* (1625-1649). The fanaticism of the *Puritans,* or "*Saints,*" grew daily more violent in England, till in the end it threatened not only the destruction of the Episcopacy, but the overthrow of the throne. These fanatical enthusiasts appealed to the Bible as authority for whatever they did, and claimed to find in it a sanction for the most atrocious crimes.

Charles was unfortunate throughout his whole reign. All his measures miscarried, and produced effects the very reverse of those intended. He was at variance with his parliament from the beginning of his reign. He set public opinion at defiance, and increased the popular discontent by selecting the Duke of Buckingham, his father's favourite, as his chief adviser and prime minister. He exasperated the Puritans in England and Presbyterians in Scotland by appointing Laud, a vehement and uncompromising Episcopalian, to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and by making him, after the assassination of Buckingham, his chief counsellor. He wounded the prejudices and roused the indignation of the whole nation by marrying a Roman Catholic, Maria Henrietta of France. And, finally, he called forth a spirit of opposition, which he was never again able to lay, by dispensing for eleven years (1629-1640) with the aid of parliament in the government of the kingdom, and substituting in room of its authority his own despotic edicts, and the arbitrary decisions of the Star Chamber.

"*No Popery*" became the rallying cry of the enemies of the king, and no display of severity on his part against the Catholics could satisfy their intolerant bigotry and insatiable craving for vengeance. The children of Catholics must be educated in the Protestant faith, and priests living in exile must be put to death if they ventured to visit the land of their fathers.

[1] In most towns of England, but notably in London, one of the features of the celebration was a grotesque figure, stuffed with straw, representing Guy Fawkes, which was carried about the streets, and finally committed to the flames. During the "*No Popery*" cry of 1850, the performance was varied by the substitution and burning of the effigy of Cardinal Wiseman, instead of that of Guy Fawkes. (Tr.)

A partiality for extemporaneous preaching and a hatred of church government by bishops were the two distinguishing characteristics of the Church of Scotland; and hence, when King James attempted, in the year 1616, to force upon it a Service Book and a Code of Ecclesiastical legislation, the attempt was successfully resisted. The scheme was revived by Charles I. in 1629, and a new Code of Ecclesiastical Law and a new Service Book were compiled, the latter of which received the royal approbation in 1636; but the Scotch churchmen again asserted their independence of the king in spiritual affairs, and their right to govern their Church and conduct their services as they thought fit. The royal party, who supported the claims of the king, were denounced from nearly every pulpit in Scotland as men who sought to "gag the Spirit of God and depose Christ from his throne." On July 23, 1637, when the Bishop of Edinburgh went to the principal church of the city to formally inaugurate the new Service, he was greeted with groans and hisses and imprecations by the audience, which was chiefly composed of females, and a stool, thrown by one of the enthusiasts, narrowly missed his head. They cried out that the "Mass was again entered; that Baal was in the church;" and told the bishop that he was "a thief, a devil's get, and of a witch's breeding." Again and again the king commanded the use of the Service to be enforced, and again and again his command was resisted by the indignant fury of the populace. The opponents of the king's policy grew daily in numbers and influence, and towards the close of the year demanded the formal revocation of the Service Book and Code of Ecclesiastical Law. In the beginning of the year 1638 a more efficient mode of resistance was agreed upon. A *National Covenant*, drawn up at Edinburgh, and intended to serve the double purpose of a Confession of Faith and a bond for uniting the whole people in one formidable body of dissenters, was ratified by the leading *Presbyterian* ministers, and subscribed to by a great multitude of persons, representing every walk of life.[1]

The king, acting on the advice of some of his counsellors, resolved to put down the Covenanters by force; but being as yet unprepared for war, he sent the Marquis of Hamilton as his commissioner to Scotland, partly with a view to gain time and partly in the hope that the Scots might be won over by concessions. He proposed to them that if they would consent to disregard the Covenant and the obligations it imposed, the Service Book and the Book of Canons should be withdrawn, and those about to enter the ministry be excused from taking the oath of supremacy and canonical obedience. The Scots, who had secret information that Charles had no intention of acting in good faith, refused to accept the royal proposal, and resolved to maintain the Covenant.

[1] *Davidson*, Historical Sketch, Illustrative of the National Confession of Faith, Edinburgh, 1849. (Tr.) *Weber*, Hist. of the Non-Catholic Churches and Sects of Great Britain, Lps., 1845, 2 vols.

At an assembly, which met at Glasgow, November 21, 1638, the Kirk, out of which, it was said, there was no salvation, was declared independent in spiritual matters, the Episcopacy was abolished, the Service Book, the Ordinal, and the Book of Canons were repudiated, and the bishops excommunicated and deposed. The proceedings of this assembly were annulled by Charles, and by the Scots received with transports of joy. Active preparations were at once made for war on both sides. The Scots began hostilities in March of the following year by the seizure of the castle of Edinburgh; and Charles, after vainly attempting to successfully oppose them, opened a conference with them at Berwick, in which, while refusing to recognize the proceedings of the assembly of Glasgow as legal, he proposed to leave the settlement of ecclesiastical questions to the decision of a general assembly, and that of civil matters to a parliament, both of which he would summon to convene in the month of August.[1]

At the assembly, which convened in Edinburgh in the following August, the king, dissembling his real feelings, reluctantly granted, through his representative, Traquaire, what it was no longer safe to refuse, and this happy consummation was hailed by the people of Scotland with shouts of triumph and prayers of thanksgiving. Charles returned to London, and summoned the parliament to meet (1640), in the hope that it would grant him the necessary supplies to carry on the war. The House of Commons, however, declined to take any notice of the royal demands until the popular grievances should have been righted, and the people's liberties guaranteed. The angry king hastily dissolved parliament, and sent an army against the Scots, which was defeated at Newburn-upon-Tyne. After this victory, the Scottish army, encouraged by the tokens of good-will everywhere manifested by the inhabitants, continued its march towards the south as far as the borders of Yorkshire. Charles was now compelled, much against his will, to again convoke parliament. The memorable sittings of this body, which is known in history as the "Long Parliament," lasted from 1640 to 1649. The two houses began their labours by asserting the liberties of the people and impeaching high officers of State. *Strafford* was brought to trial, condemned, and beheaded, and Archbishop *Laud* was cast into prison. Fresh demands were daily made upon the king, and new limitations put upon his prerogatives. Charles, conscious that the conflict between himself and his parliament would have to be submitted to the arbitration of arms, withdrew from London, and, on the 22nd of August, 1642, unfurled the royal standard at Nottingham. The parliamentary leaders allied themselves with the Scotch *covenanters* "for the maintenance of the liberties of the Scotch Kirk and the reformation of the Church of England." In order to excite the prejudices and inflame the hatred of the people against the king and those who espoused his cause, they were branded as Papists by their opponents. In spite of the fact

[1] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. IX., pp. 354-367. (Tr.)

that Charles had had a number of priests put to death, it was reported, and generally believed, that the Catholics were conspiring in his favour. While the sufferings of the Catholics were many and terrible, those endured by the Episcopalians, if fewer and less rigorous, were still sufficiently aggravating to tax human patience to the utmost, and to excite popular indignation against the persecutors. So intensely bitter was the feeling of the Presbyterians against the Established Church that, through their influence, its members were driven from their seats in parliament, and, if churchmen, deprived of their livings. The violence of the Presbyterians at length called forth a spirit of reaction in their own ranks, thus giving rise to a new party, known as the *Independents*, and recognising *Fairfax* and *Oliver Cromwell* as their leaders. Admitting neither a priesthood nor a ministry, to which the office of preaching necessarily attached, they permitted anyone, who believed himself moved by the Holy Ghost, to expound the Word of God, a task which army officers, and even common soldiers, took upon them to perform. An army inspired with such enthusiasm, and led by a cool-headed, calculating general, was capable of extraordinary achievements, and hence the Parliamentarians, victorious throughout the whole struggle, crowned their triumph by a decisive victory over the king at the *Battle of Naseby*, in May, 1645.

After a series of disasters, Charles attempted to make his escape from the country, which, failing to do, he gave himself up to the Scottish army, by whose authority he was transferred to the Parliamentarians, and by them cast into prison at Holmby. Refusing to purchase his personal safety by a sacrifice of his principles and a surrender of his convictions, he was detained in prison until he was seized by the Independents, who wished to have possession of his person as a security against the hostile designs of the Presbyterians. In 1647, the king was transferred to Hampton Court, whence he escaped to the Isle of Wight, in the hope of being able to take passage in a vessel which the queen had sent from France to convey him thither. His design was frustrated by the vigilance and energy of the governor, and an uprising of the inhabitants of the island in his favour was instantly suppressed. Both houses of parliament passed a bill forbidding all further negotiations with the captive king, under penalty of high treason.

The power of the army was now at its height, and the "*Levellers*," a fanatical sect, which included among its numbers the bulk of the private soldiers and many of the officers, pretended to demonstrate from Holy Scripture that the principle of popular sovereignty was the only true basis of government, and that all kings were hateful to God. The recent victories gained by Cromwell over the Scots, who attempted to rescue the king (1648), assured the triumph of the *Radicals*. They demanded that Charles should be brought to trial "as a man of blood," who had done his "utmost against the Lord's cause and people in this poor nation." The Presbyterians, who re-

fused to share the views of the Independents and act in harmony with their designs, were forcibly driven from their places in the House of Commons, which, consisting now of only sixty members—*The Rump Parliament*—appointed a commission to try Charles on the charge of high treason, in that he had levied war against the Parliament of England. The king was brought to trial before the commission, assembled in Westminster Hall, and presided over by John Bradshaw, on the 20th of January, 1649. He received his sentence on the 27th, and three days later was beheaded.

The Commonwealth was now proclaimed in England. *Charles II.*, who had been recalled from the Continent and crowned King of Scotland, after having been disastrously defeated by Cromwell at Worcester in 1651, made his escape with some difficulty to France. This victory virtually made Cromwell supreme ruler of England; but, to give a colour of legality to his acts, he was invested with the authority and title of *Lord Protector* by parliament in the year 1653.[1] The policy pursued by this extraordinary man, who was by nature always stern and frequently tyrannical, soon put a period to anarchy at home, and made his government respected abroad. He put down every attempt at resistance with an iron hand; and when he died, in 1658, peace reigned throughout the land, and all ranks professed to obey, if they did not respect, his authority. On his death, his eldest son, Richard, was proclaimed Protector by council; but, destitute of the qualfications which fit one for so high and important an office, he was forced to resign in April, 1659, after holding his dignity little more than seven months; and in the following year *Charles II.* was invited from the Continent to assume the title and responsibilities of King of England. Charles being deeply impressed with the conviction, which seemed a sort of first principle with the members of the House of Stuart, that *episcopacy* is the upholder of the throne, had it again re-established both in England and in Scotland. This measure, besides being extremely unpopular, rendered the king suspected of being at heart a Catholic, and drew upon him the enmity of many. Cromwell had granted freedom of conscience to persons of every sect and shade of religious opinion, *excepting Catholics alone*, whose condition was not bettered under Charles II., notwithstanding that his brother, the Duke of York, was an earnest professor of the Catholic faith. They were accused of having been the authors of the great fire of London in 1666, and although there has never been produced a single shred of evidence in support of the charge, the lie is still perpetuated in an inscription on a monument erected in London to commemorate the disaster.

In the year 1673, a statute known as the "*Test Act*," and directed chiefly against James, Duke of York, passed the House of Commons, ordaining that all persons should be declared incapable of holding

[1] *Villemain*, Histoire de Cromwell d'après les Mémoirs du Temps et les Recueils Parlementaires, Paris, 1819, 2 vols. *Ranke*, Vol. III.

any office of public trust, either civil or military, and be disqualified to sue in courts of law and equity, to act as guardians or executors, or to take any legacy or deed of gift, who should refuse to take the oath of allegiance and supremacy, or decline to receive in public the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England, and subscribe a declaration denying the doctrine of transubstantiation.[1] Every possible means was resorted to, no matter how infamous, to suppress Catholicism and rouse public indignation against its professors. *Lord Shaftesbury*, who had been mainly instrumental in having the "Test Act" passed, now pretended that he had private information of a "Popish Plot" to assassinate the king, massacre the Protestants, and burn the city of London, and that the conspirators, who were acting under the direction of the general of the Jesuits, included in their ranks nearly every Catholic in the kingdom. The Plot was the pure invention of one *Titus Oates*, or *Ambrose*, a man of disreputable character, who, taking advantage of a few adventitious circumstances, contrived a story so plausible that it readily obtained credence in the then excited state of the public mind. The subject was brought before parliament. Oates was hailed as the saviour of the Protestants, granted a pension of nine hundred pounds a year, and assigned a suite of apartments at Whitehall. By the aid of suborned witnesses and truculent juries, many innocent Roman Catholic gentlemen were convicted of complicity in the Plot, and died the death of traitors at the block, protesting their innocence with their last breath.

Charles II. was taken ill on February 2, 1685, and died four days later, after having made his peace with the Church of Rome, and received the consolations of her Sacraments.

Notwithstanding the existence of an *Exclusion Bill*, which had passed the House of Commons, declaring James, Duke of York, debarred from inheriting the Crown of England, he succeeded to his brother without opposition (1685). On the 4th of April, 1687, he published a *Declaration of Indulgence*, granting liberty of conscience and freedom of worship to all his subjects. Had he been content with doing this much, he might, in all probability, have greatly ameliorated the condition of his Catholic co-religionists, without imperilling his own title to the throne. But being a devout and zealous Catholic, he desired to restore that faith to its ancient ascendancy, and, by his efforts to do so, alarmed the jealousy and alienated the affections of his Protestant subjects, and thus prepared the way for his speedy downfall. He renewed relations with Rome, and dispensed Catholics from the obligation of taking the Test Oath, thus removing their disqualifications for holding office. On the 27th of April, 1688, James again published his *Declaration of Indulgence*, with some slight additions, and ordered it to be read in all the churches of the kingdom. This many of the clergy refused to do, and seven of the

[1] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. XII., pp. 28, 190, 191. (Tr.)

bishops, who ventured on a written remonstrance, were committed to the Tower on the charge of seditious libel, tried, and acquitted. The misfortunes of James culminated in the birth of a male heir apparent, known in history as "*The Pretender*," an event which, while bringing joy to the heart of the king, would, under different circumstances, have been hailed as a blessing by the nation. But now the prospect of a new line of Catholic rulers was viewed with apprehension by the discontented of every class, and with positive alarm by the holders of property formerly belonging to the Church. On the night of the 29th of June, 1688, the day of the acquittal of the bishops who had remonstrated in writing against reading the Declaration of Indulgence, and been indicted for libel in consequence, a message, signed by seven leading English politicians, was despatched to *William, Prince of Orange*, begging him to come over to England and occupy the throne. William, who was then Stadtholder of the United Provinces, having married Mary, the daughter of James II., and a Protestant in religion, regarded his wife as the lawful heir to the English throne, and secretly favoured every scheme for depriving her father of the crown. He accordingly accepted the invitation, and setting out with an army of fourteen thousand men, composed of English and Dutch, landed at Torbay, in Devonshire, November 5, 1688, and was hailed as the "National Deliverer," come "to set the affairs of the realm in order." James, betrayed by his army, and deserted by his children, after making a short but ineffectual resistance, fled to France, and landed at Ambleteuse, December 25. His flight facilitated at once the triumph of his enemies, and furnished the chief ground of accusation against himself. He was declared to have abdicated the Government, thereby leaving the throne vacant, and William and Mary were called to rule the English people as joint sovereigns. The date of their accession is coincident with the beginning of the "Protestant Ascendency." Catholics and those married to Catholics were for ever declared incapable of wearing the crown of England; a new oath of allegiance was drawn up and prescribed; the right enjoyed by Catholics of appointing to livings was withdrawn from them and bestowed upon the universities; and all Catholics, or those reputed to be such, were ordered not to approach within a distance of ten miles of London. An Act of Toleration, passed in the year 1698, granted liberty of conscience and freedom of worship to all except to *Socinians and Catholics*. The latter endured hardships the most rigorous on account of their faith, being deprived of civil and political rights of every kind. Catholic schools were closed and Catholic priests were hunted down. Such Catholic clergymen as consented to give up their faith and enter what was styled "*the one, true, saving, and apostolic Church of England*," received the gift of splendid livings as a reward of their apostasy. Any Catholic child, who went over to the Established Church, obtained in his own right, even during the lifetime of his parents, and to the exclusion of his brothers and sisters, the whole family inheritance.

That under such circumstances the Catholic faith did not become wholly extinct in Great Britain can be satisfactorily accounted for only by ascribing its preservation to the overruling guidance of its Divine Founder. This barbarous persecution was carried on without intermission or abatement throughout the whole course of the eighteenth century; and it required the fear inspired by the American War of Independence, and the dread of the contagious influence ot the French Revolution, to extort from either statesmen or high-church functionaries any amelioration of the Penal Laws directed against Catholics.

§ 330. *Protestantism in Scotland.*

J. Knox, Hist. of the Reform. of Scotland (till 1567), London, 1664, f. and often. *D. Calderwood*, Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland, London, 1678, fol., Edinb., 1845, 7 vols. *Gil. Stuart*, History of the Establishment of the Reformation in Scotland, London, 1780, 4to; and The History of Scotland from the Establishment of the Reformation to the Death of Queen Mary. His object in this was to defend that unfortunate princess against Dr. Robertson and others. *G. Cook*, History of the Reformation in Scotland, Edinburgh, 1811, 3 vols., 8vo; and History of the Church of Scotland, 3 vols., 8vo, 1815. *Wm. Bradshaw*, English Puritanism, containing the main opinions of the rigidest sort of those that went by that name in the realm of England, London, 1605 (Lat. trans., Puritanismus Anglicanus, Fref., 1610). *Wm. Robertson*, History of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1759, 2 vols. He passed over the earlier periods as "dark and fabulous." (Germ. tr., Brunswick, 2 pts.) *Keith* (Bishop), History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland, Edin., 1734, fol. *G. Chalmers*, Life of Mary, Queen of Scots, Lond., 1818, 2 vols., 4to; 1822, 3 vols., 8vo. *P. F. Tytler*, The History of Scotland, Edin., 1828-1843, 9 vols. *M. Laing*, Hist. of Scotland, 4 vols.; remarkable only for its partiality and attacks upon the character of the unfortunate Mary. Her great defender, Prince *Labanoff*, Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart, London, 1844, 7 vols., 8vo; from which Rev. *Donald McLeod* drew the Life of Mary, Queen of Scots, New York, 1857. *M. Teulet*, Papiers d' Etat relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Ecosse, Paris, 1851-1860, 3 vols., 4to; 1862, 5 vols., 8vo. Miss *Agnes Strickland*, Lives of the Queens of Scotland, Edin., 1850-1859, 8 vols., 8vo. *J. Cunningham*, Church History of Scotland, 2 vols. (from a Presbyterian point of view). *Geo. Grub*, Eccl. Hist. of Scotland, 4 vols. (from an Episcopalian point of view). *Burton*, Hist. of Scotland (with numerous notices of eccl. affairs). *T. Innes*, Law of Creeds in Scotland. *J. Skinner*, Eccl. Hist. of Scotland, London, 1818, 2 vols., 8vo. Analecta Scotia, illustr. the civil, eccl., and lit. Hist. of Scotland, Edinb., 1834-1837, 12 vols., 8vo. *J. A. Froude*, Hist. of England, New York, 1865, 12 vols. *Macaulay*, Hist. of England. *Stanley* (Dean of Westminster), Lectures on the Hist. of the Church of Scotland, New York, 1872. *Wm. von Schütz*, Mary Stuart, Mentz, 1839, 2 vols.; cf. concerning it Periodical of Historical Science, by *Neander*, year 1857. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. I., p. 457 sq.; Vol. III. p. 696 sq. *K. G. v. Rudloff*, Hist. of the Reform. in Scotland, Berlin, 1847-1849, 2 vols. *Kœslin*, The Church of Scotland and her Relation to the State, Hamburg, 1852. *W. M. Hetherington*, Hist. of the Church of Scotland till 1843, 4th ed. Edinb., 1853, 8vo; 3rd ed., New York, 1844, 8vo.

The introduction of the Reformation into Scotland was accompanied by deeds of exceptional atrocity. By an act of the Scotch parliament of 1525, the importation of books treating of Lutheranism was prohibited, and all persons forbidden to take any other means of giving publicity to the Reformer's teachings. *Patrick Hamilton*, Abbot of Ferne, during a stay in the cities of Wittenberg and Marburg, had become acquainted with the principles of Lutheranism, and after his return home disregarded the prohibition of parliament, and began to propagate the new heresy. He was arrested, tried, and burned at the stake, opposite St. Andrew's College, in February, 1528

Of those who followed in his footsteps, and continued to spread the teachings of Luther, some, like him, expiated their offence at the stake, while others fled either to England or the Continent. These cruelties, coming with ill grace from a corrupt clergy, who were themselves the objects of public derision and contempt, still further roused the fury of their adversaries. who soon took a bloody vengeance.

The inhabitants of the country gradually divided themselves into two hostile parties, which came into direct collision with each other in the year 1546. On the 28th of February of this year, *George Wishart*, the most eloquent of the Scotch Reformers, was arrested by the orders of *Cardinal Beaton*, the powerful Archbishop of St. Andrew's, brought to trial, and burned at the stake.[1] On the 29th of the following May, a number of the Reform party, headed by *Norman Lesley*, attacked and murdered the cardinal, and seized and plundered his palace of St. Andrew's, which became temporarily the stronghold of the Reformers.

But of all those who preached the teachings of the Reformation in Scotland, none achieved such successes as the impetuous and eloquent *John Knox*.[2] Brought up a Catholic, and educated for the service of the Church, he took priest's orders some time before 1530, and about twelve years later (1542) openly professed himself a Protestant. Hearing of the assassination of Cardinal Beaton, he gave it as his opinion that the deed had been of divine inspiration. He took up his residence at the castle of St. Andrew's, after its capture by the Reformers, and in 1547 began his career as a preacher in the parish church of the same name by an intemperate denunciation of the errors of Popery. When the fortress was taken by the royal troops, *Knox*, being one of the captured prisoners, was conducted across to France, where he spent nearly two years in the galleys. Returning to England, he again began to preach, was appointed one of the chaplains to Edward VI., fell in love, and was married. When Mary succeeded to the throne of England, Knox, with others of the Reformers, withdrew to the Continent. He spent some time at Dieppe, Geneva, and Frankfort-on-the-Main, made a short visit to Scotland to encourage the Reformers (1555), and returned to Geneva (1556), where he passed nearly three years in charge of a church, and became a thoroughgoing Calvinist.

Affairs in Scotland seemed to conspire to favour the Reformers. The weak and vain *Earl of Arran*, who became regent on the death of James V., in 1542, was quite content to allow the innovators to

[1] It should be stated, however, that Wishart's complicity in a plot entered into by the more zealous of the Reformers for the assassination of Card. Beaton, was the immediate occasion of his arrest.

[2] *Th. M'Crie*, Lives of John Knox and Andrew Melville, Edinburgh, 1811, 2 vols., and frequently ed.; in an abridgment by *Plank*, Göttingen, 1817 (panegyric). *Weber*, John Knox and the Scottish Church (Studies and Criticisms, nro. 4). *Brandes*, John Knox, the Reformer of Scotland, Elberfeld, 1862. (Lives and Select Writings of the Fathers and Founders of the Reformed Church, Pt. X.)

have their own way, provided only the prosecution of their plans did not lead to open rebellion. When Mary succeeded to the throne, she saw herself condemned to be an idle spectator of the uninterrupted progress of the new teachings, which had been propagated chiefly by English refugees who sought an asylum in Scotland after the accession of Mary Tudor to the throne (1553), and of whom John Willock was the most distinguished. A *Synod* convened in Edinburgh in 1549 to provide measures for the removal of the ignorance and the correction of the morals of the Scottish clergy, but it was already too late to effect any good. Among his other labours, Knox occupied himself during his stay at Geneva in writing a work, published in 1558, entitled, "*The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regimen of Women*," being a violent attack upon Mary of Guise, Regent of Scotland, and Mary Tudor, Queen of England.

From Geneva, Knox kept up an active correspondence with his partisans in Scotland, whom he counselled to employ force, should other means fail, for the suppression of an idolatrous worship and the overthrow of an idolatrous government. He was fond of repeating that, "*by no other means were owls so effectually frightened away as by burning their nests.*" The passions of the multitude, which had been recently aroused by the burning of *Walter Milne*, an apostate priest, were still further inflamed when, in 1559, Knox was recalled to Scotland, and began to preach against the idolatry of the Mass and the veneration of images. The "rascal multitude," as Knox afterwards called those who only put his precepts into practice, roused to fury by the fiery denunciations he had launched against an idolatrous worship, proceeded to demolish the images and tear and trample under foot the pictures in the churches of the city of Perth, and sack and lay in ruins the houses of the Franciscan and Dominican friars, and the monastery of the Carthusians. Similar outrages were perpetrated in other cities of Scotland. The inauguration of the Reformed Religion was always preceded by the sacking of churches, the destruction of images, and the utter demolition of whatever in any way referred to the Mass, or had any connection with the veneration of saints. The Scottish Reformers, with a view to centralising their power, formed a covenant, which came to be known as the *Congregation*, and its leaders as *Lords of the Congregation*. Between that portion of the population represented by this body and assisted by *Elizabeth*, Queen of England, and the adherents of the queen-regent, assisted by the King of France, a civil war of twelve months' duration was carried on, which was characterized by incidents of unusual atrocity. While the English troops were investing Edinburgh, the queen-regent died, after which both parties agreed to a truce, during which it was arranged to summon a parliament, to whose action the settlement of their difficulties should be left. The parliament, which assembled in August, 1560, declared the Reformed the established religion of Scotland, and interdicted Catholic worship. When, therefore, *Mary Stuart*, after the death of her husband, *Francis II.*, Dauphin of France,

returned to Scotland, August 21, 1561, to enter upon the government of that kingdom, she found her religion, to which she was devotedly attached, abolished, and the penalty of confiscation and death decreed against anyone who should hear Mass. The old Catholic faith had been replaced by a rigid *Calvinism*, and the *episcopal* form of church government by that of *Presbyters*, belonging to the "Community of the Saints."[1] This democratic system was applied to politics as well as religion. Under these circumstances, Mary Stuart, while refusing to formally concede all the claims put forward by the victorious Reformers, was, nevertheless, content to leave matters as she found them, and even condescended to gratify their wishes in everything consistent with her duty as a Catholic and her dignity as a queen. Disregarding the counsels of the more zealous of the Roman Catholics, she selected her advisers from among the Protestants, and appointed as her minister of state her illegitimate brother, *James Stuart*, an ambitious and able statesman, whom she afterwards created *Earl of Murray*. But, while granting freedom of worship to others, she claimed for herself the liberty of hearing Mass said in the chapel of the castle of Edinburgh, a concession which Knox and others of the extreme Reformers denounced as an offence against the law of God, which would inevitably draw down the divine vengeance upon the whole land. "I had rather," said Knox, "face ten thousand enemies than know that one Mass is said in Scotland." So violent were his denunciations, and so effective in their results, that when Mary made her solemn entrance into Edinburgh, the city council issued a proclamation, expelling from the city "the whole wicked rabble of Antichrist and the Pope, to wit, priests, monks, lay-brothers, fornicators, and adulterers." While the manners of Mary's court were not of that stern and gloomy severity which the Scotch Reformers affected, it must also be admitted that, in their judgments of her, they were harsh and unjust, rather than equitable and tolerant. Knox, who was fully alive to the impression which her singular beauty and attractive address would make upon those with whom she came in contact, resolved to counteract any influence she might derive from her personal graces and charm of manner by coarse invectives against her policy and indelicate insinuations against her character. Her marriage with her cousin, Henry Stuart, Lord *Darnley*, son of the Earl of Lennox, whose whole family were reputed zealous Catholics, he had the indecent effrontery to liken to the union between Ahab and Jezebel. This marriage, which was celebrated at Holyrood, July 29, 1565, though perfectly honourable, was disastrous in its consequences. It was the occasion of a revolt, headed by Murray and the Hamiltons, who, disappointed in their hopes of assistance from the Protestants, were

[1] "The government and discipline of the Church rest, on the Presbyterian theory, with collective bodies of teaching (or clerical) elders, generally called 'ministers,' and ruling or (lay) elders, who are generally meant when 'elders' are spoken of, gathered in Synods, and not with individual persons, as in the Episcopal system, or with individual congregations, as in the Independent system." *Blunt*, Dict. of Heresies, &c., art. "Presbyterians." (Tr.)

defeated by the forces of the queen, who had taken the field in person against them. Mary now began to awake to the fact that her marriage with Darnley had been a mistake. His morals were dissolute, his arrogance intolerant, and his ambition boundless. But, while he possessed all the vices, he had none of the virtues of a strong character. He had received from Mary the title of king; but, not content with this, demanded that the crown should be secured to him for life, and that in the event of the queen's dying without issue, it should descend to his heirs. His demands having been refused, he entered into a conspiracy with Murray, Morton, and others of the Protestant leaders, for the murder of Riccio, Mary's secretary, who, he persuaded them, was the real obstacle to the accomplishment of his wishes. Entering the queen's apartments, the assassins, headed by the king, seized the poor Italian, dragged him into the antechamber, and despatched him with more than fifty wounds (March 9, 1556). Speaking of this atrocious and cowardly murder, the pious Knox said it was "a just act and worthy of all praise." The queen succeeded, by kind attentions and demonstrations of love, in detaching her husband from the conspirators; but, although her affection for him seemed to revive as the time of her confinement drew near, she was again soon alienated from him. Darnley was taken ill of the smallpox at Glasgow towards the middle of January, 1567. He was removed thence to Edinburgh, where he was lodged in a small house beside the Kirk of the Field. This house was blown up by gunpowder on the night of the 9th of February, and Darnley's lifeless body found in the neighbouring garden. Notwithstanding that Mary visited him daily while here, spending some whole nights under the same roof, and showing him every attention and kindness, she has been accused of complicity in his murder, although no satisfactory evidence of her guilt has ever been produced. Bothwell was generally believed to have been at the bottom of the plot, and Mary's marriage to him, only three months after the murder of her late husband, in spite of the fact that she had been abducted by violence, and her consent extorted by force, gave colour of truth to the damaging suspicions that were put in circulation by her enemies.

This fatal step was speedily followed by disaster. A faction, including many of the nobility of Scotland, and headed by Earl Murray, rose in arms; and unable to hold out against them, she was forced to surrender herself a prisoner into their hands. She was prevailed upon while a captive to sign an act of abdication in favour of her son, *James*, then only thirteen months of age, which she did at Lochleven, July 24th. Murray was named regent during the minority of the young king, and bound himself by oath to extirpate the enemies of the Gospel from Scotland. Accused of adultery and complicity in the assassination of Darnley, and vanquished by her enemies, Mary committed the fatal blunder of accepting the proffered hospitality of Elizabeth of England, her most inveterate enemy, from whose hands she never escaped.[1]

[1] *Fred. v. Raumer*, Elizabeth and Mary, Lps., 1836.

The pious and rebellious Knox died in 1572, confessing that he was "wearied of the world," and his place was filled by another Reformer, quite as radical and fanatical as himself, named *Andrew Melville*. *James VI.* succeeded to the government of the kingdom in 1578, and, true to the traditionary policy of the House of Stuart, did what he could to strengthen the authority of the *Episcopacy*. His efforts, however, were frustrated by the boldness and energy of the Presbyterians. The general assembly of 1581 commanded all bishops to resign their sees, and forbade them to exercise any episcopal function, under penalty of banishment from the kingdom. By an act of parliament of the year 1584, the Episcopacy was again re-established, and all attempts against the royal person declared high treason.

But now that James had the sanction of parliament for the restoration of the Episcopacy, he lacked the power to carry the act into execution, and was once more obliged to yield to the demands of the Presbyterians, whose system of church government was legalized by parliament in 1592. The bishops, while permitted to retain their seats in parliament, were deprived of all right to exercise ecclesiastical functions, and forbidden to bear the title of bishop.

In spite of the persistent persecution directed against the Catholic religion in Scotland, it never quite disappeared from the land; and, after maintaining itself in obscurity for centuries in the Highlands, has been steadily gaining ground, and making notable progress in these latter days.

§ 331. *Protestantism in Ireland.*

Thos. Moore, Memoirs of Captain Rock, ed. 1824 and 1852. The *same*, History of Ireland, forming 4 vols. of Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia, 1839-1846. *O'Connell*, A Memoir of Ireland, Native and Saxon, 1 vol. 8vo, Dublin, 1843. Ireland's Situation, from an ecclesiastical point of view, in the *Tubingen Quarterly Review*, year 1840, p. 549 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. V., pp. 490 sq. *Thos. Darcy M'Gee*, Hist. of the Attempt to Establish the Protestant Reformation in Ireland, Boston, 1853. *Brenan, O. S. F.*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, Dublin, 1864. *W. D. Killen*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, London, 1875.

The very name of Ireland is associated in the mind with civil and religious persecution.

The first attempts to rob Ireland of her independence and her people of their freedom date back to the reign of Henry II., in 1166. Those districts, occupied at different times by the English settlers, were known under the general name of "the Pale," the geographical limit of which varied with the fortunes of the English arms in Ireland. From the inhabitants of the Pale, the members of the so-called Irish parliament into whose hands the destinies of the nation were committed, were selected. Once Henry VIII. had made up his mind to become supreme spiritual head of the Church of England, he was equally anxious to enjoy the same title and authority in Ireland. The archiepiscopal see of Dublin falling vacant, Cromwell appointed to it one George Brown (1535), then provincial of the Order of Augustinians in England,

and formerly a Lutheran. Having arrived in Dublin, he and the commissioners from Henry VIII., who accompanied him, summoned some of the bishops and nobles to the Castle of Dublin, and called on them to subscribe to the supremacy of the king in the spiritual affairs of the Church of Ireland. *George Cormer*, Primate of Ireland, indignantly repelled such a claim, and summoning the Episcopacy of the country before him, called on them to resist to the last this attempt to open a schism in the Irish Church. This scheme failing, Lord Grey, the deputy, called the parliament to meet at Dublin, May 1, 1536, and by this body Henry VIII. was declared "sole and supreme head on earth of the Church of Ireland,"[1] the Pope's jurisdiction renounced, and all who should maintain it rendered subject to the penalties of *præmunire*."[2]

The royal supremacy was recognized by a few sordid bishops and priests, who set more value upon the goods of this world than upon their own salvation in the next;[3] and some of the Irish chieftains were won over by royal favour and bounty. But the great bulk of the Irish people opposed a vigorous and persevering resistance to the progress of the Reformation, being unable to comprehend in what the belief of men, who entered the country crying "Death to the Irish," could be superior to their own ancient faith, which counselled peace and good-will to all. Preachers were brought over from England, and the English liturgy introduced, with a view to facilitate and hasten the work of the Reformation in Ireland; but, strange to say, the results that followed were the reverse of what had been anticipated.

The resistance of the Irish to the new teachings grew daily more pronounced and energetic. Every royal artifice and every display of kingly power, designed to alienate their affections from the ancient

[1] *Brenan*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, Dublin, 1864, pp. 392-393. (Tr.) In a letter dated September, 1535, written by Archbishop Brown to Cromwell, the writer says: "He had endeavoured almost to the hazard of his life, to reduce the nobility and gentry of Ireland to due obedience in owning the king their supreme head, as well spiritual as temporal; but that he was much opposed therein, especially by Cormer, Archbishop of Armagh, who had laid a curse on the people whoever should own the king's supremacy, and had thereby drawn to him the most of his suffragans and clergy within his jurisdiction; that the archbishop and priests of Armagh had sent two messengers to Rome, and that it was feared O'Neill (the great chief of Ulster) would be ordered by the Pope to oppose the changes." *Killen*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, London, 1875, Vol. I., pp. 338-339. This writer is a Protestant, and shows the animus of a bigoted partisan. (Tr.)

[2] "All officials of every class were required to take the oath of supremacy, and all who refused were declared guilty of high treason. Several of the old penal laws were revived. Marriage and fostering with the Irish were forbidden, and throughout the Pale the English language and habit were strictly enjoined. A law was made for the establishment of an English school in every district." *Killen*, L. c., pp. 339-340. Of Archbishop Brown, through whose exertions the Statute of Supremacy was passed, the same writer says: "Instead of insisting that at least a portion of them (the spoils of the dissolved abbeys) should be employed in promoting the general enlightenment of the people, he solicits once and again for a share to himself, though he already enjoyed a very ample income." Ibid. L. c., p. 341. Such has always been the character of the men who have felt themselves called to improve upon the work of God, and supply the shortcomings of his censurable neglect. (Tr.)

[3] *Brenan*, L. c., p. 394. (Tr.)

faith, failed utterly of their purpose. In vain did an Anglo-Irish parliament, held at Dublin in 1542, proclaim Henry "*King of Ireland;*" in vain were peerages conferred upon some of the native princes. The absence of the bishops from the parliament was significant of the temper of the country, and no attempt was made by the natives to disguise their hostility to all foreign domination. Even the representatives of those English families that had been long settled in the land spurned the new teachings as contemptuously as did the ancient Irish. A new dynasty had indeed been thrust upon the country; but, instead of inspiring love, it called forth the execrations of the people, who from that day forth have never ceased to regard the cause of their national independence and the cause of their religion as inseparably bound up together, and to view an attack on the one as a menace against the other.

On the accession of Edward VI., the Duke of Somerset, the Protector, issued a proclamation in the king's name, ordaining that the Liturgy of the Church of England should be introduced into all places of worship, and commanding all bishops and priests to yield obedience to the royal will. George Brown,[1] Archbishop of Dublin, obeyed with alacrity, and on Easter Sunday, 1551, had the new service read in the Cathedral of Christ's Church in his own presence. The other bishops of the country, proving less pliable than the servile Brown, were commanded by the viceroy, Sir Anthony St. Leger, to come up to Dublin, where, assembled in the council chamber, they listened to the reading of the royal proclamation. When it was ended, *George Dowdall,* Primate of Armagh, rose up, and, after having protested against its instructions as dangerous and unwarrantable innovations, abruptly left the chamber, followed by all the clergy, with the exception of Brown of Dublin; Staples, Bishop of Meath; and John Bale, a Carmelite, who, as a reward for his apostasy, was afterwards thrust by royal power into the See of Ossory,[2] whence he was expelled, after a short stay, by the fury of an outraged people. The dignified and manly course of Dowdall was too great an offence to go unpunished, and he was accordingly deprived of his see, and an Englishman, named *Goodacre,* appointed in his place. The title of Primate of All Ireland was also withdrawn from the See of Armagh, and conferred upon that of Dublin, as an additional recompense to Brown for his many virtues and his still more numerous services in the cause of reform. Every means that human ingenuity could devise, or human power execute, was now brought into play to induce

[1] It would appear that this archbishop, who was so inveterate an enemy of superstition that his zeal led him to cast into the fire the crosier, known as the *Staff of Jesus,* which well-authenticated tradition said had belonged to St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, and for eleven hundred years had been held in veneration as one of Ireland's most precious relics, was not himself very fond of missionary work. *Killen,* the Protestant historian of the Irish Church, informs us that "his sermons could not have occupied more than from *eight* to *ten* minutes each in the delivery," and that "he preached only *twice* in the year." L. c., Vol. I., p. 341, note 3, and p. 365, note 1. (Tr.)

[2] *Brenan,* L. c., p. 398. It is remarkable that these apostates were Englishmen. (Tr.)

the Irish clergy and people to prove recreant to the venerable faith of their fathers. Threats, bribes, flattery, promises of wealth, honours, and distinctions, all served their turn, and all were contemptuously rejected or disregarded. Of the Irish Episcopacy, except those already mentioned, *Magenis*, Bishop of Down, and *Burke*, Bishop of Clonfert, were alone found willing to give up their faith from motives of avarice. A few Irish priests also apostatized, and received mitres as a recompense for their dishonour.[1]

Edward VI. died in 1553, and on the 6th of July of the same year *Mary* succeeded to the throne. During her reign the Catholics of Ireland enjoyed a short respite from the persecutions of the preceding one. Priests came forth from their places of concealment, where they had sought a refuge to escape the fury of their pursuers; churches and chapels that had been closed or desecrated were again opened and restored to their ancient uses; George Dowdall, who had retired to the Continent, returned and took possession of his See of Armagh; Brown, Staples, Lancaster, and Travers were deposed, and the same fate would have overtaken Casey and Bale had they not prudently retired of their own accord; immoral ecclesiastics were punished; pastors were again set over their flocks; and order, morality, and religion once more held empire over the hearts of a faithful people. It is a signal proof of the humanity and forgiving temper of the Irish race that, notwithstanding the indignities and atrocities endured by them during the preceding reign, this complete change was brought about without the shedding of a single drop of blood. For the purpose of reforming what needed reformation in the Irish Church, Archbishop Dowdall called a National Synod, which convened at Drogheda (1554), and was attended by nearly all the Catholic bishops of the country. Here several decrees were made, restoring ancient practices of the Church that had fallen into disuse, and providing for the correction or punishment of immoral ecclesiastics.[2] In May, 1556, Viscount Fitzwalter entered upon his duties as viceroy, and in July of the same year parliament met in Dublin. An act was passed by this parliament, setting forth that the title of "Supreme Head of the Church" could not "be justly attributable to any king or governor," and that the Holy See should "have and enjoy the same authority and jurisdiction" as had been lawfully exercised by His Holiness the Pope during the early part of the reign of Henry VIII.[3]

Protestantism was now nearly extinct in Ireland, there being only three or four reformed preachers in the land,[4] and the future of the Catholic Church seemed full of hope and promise, when the whole

[1] Only three are mentioned, says *Brenan*, L. c., in our authentic annals, namely, Robert Travers, Thomas Lancaster, and William Casey. The first became Bishop of Leighlin, the second Bishop of Kildare, and the third Bishop of Limerick. (Tr.)

[2] *Brenan*, L. c., pp. 401-404. (Tr.)

[3] The 3rd and 4th of Philip and Mary, chap. VIII., as quoted by *Killen*. (Tr.)

[4] *Killen*, L. c., Vol. I., p. 365. (Tr.)

aspect of affairs was changed by the death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth (1558). During this and succeeding reigns a violent persecution was carried on against the Irish Catholics, so cold-blooded, systematic, and atrocious that, since the time of the Pharaohs, the world has seen nothing comparable to it. Violence was practised under the forms of law; brute force was employed where other means failed; and to attempt any resistance, even in defence of the most sacred rights, was declared an act of high treason. Such, with the exception of short seasons of peace, occurring at long intervals, was the normal condition of Ireland for three centuries. To hold that country dependent on England, the people were kept in a chronic state of insurrection, and the ministers of Elizabeth did not attempt to conceal that they practised so infamous a means for so iniquitous a purpose. When, goaded to desperation, the people rose in rebellion, they were put down by fire and sword, and the work of destruction was completed by the ravages of famine. But while this policy carried ruin and death to the people, it secured no solid advantages to Protestantism, in whose interest it was inaugurated, notwithstanding that Catholic bishops and priests were driven from their sees and parishes, their goods confiscated, and they themselves either banished the country or put to death.

In the year 1559, Thomas, Earl of Sussex, acting on the order of his sovereign, summoned the Irish parliament to meet in Dublin. This assembly, from which the Catholic nobles were carefully excluded, is described by Hooker as "more like a bear-beating of disorderly persons than a parliament of wise and grave men."[1] Still agitators of this character, whose undignified conduct excited the contempt of their own apologists, ordained that the Book of Common Prayer should be used in all places of public worship. If a priest celebrated the Lord's Supper, either publicly or in private, in any manner other than that laid down in the Liturgy of the Church of England, he was condemned to forfeit a year's income and be imprisoned six months for the first offence; to forfeit his income forever and be imprisoned at pleasure for the second; and for the third to be imprisoned during the term of his natural life. Laymen using any form of worship other than that contained in the Book of Common Prayer were sent to prison for one year for the first, and for life for the second offence; and all persons, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, holding livings or offices, were ordered to come forward, under penalty of deprivation and forfeiture, and take the oath of Supremacy.[2]

Speaking of the character of the men who went over to Ireland to introduce the Reformation into that country, Spenser, himself a Protestant, and an eye-witness of what he attests, says: "Whatever disorders you see in the Established Church through England, you

[1] *Brenan*, L. c., p. 404. (Tr.)
[2] Lib. Stat., p. 201, quoted by *Brenan*, L. c., p. 405. (Tr.)

may find here, and many more, namely, *grosse simony, greedy covetousness, fleshy incontinency, carelesse sloath, and generally all disordered life in the common clergyman.*"[1]

The legislation already in operation proving ineffectual to prevent the Catholic clergy of Ireland from providing for the interests of the Church by secret meetings held in Dublin, the Earl of Essex issued a proclamation in 1563, forbidding all priests, whether secular or regular, either to meet or reside in the city, and republished a former edict, commanding all heads of families to attend Protestant service every Sunday. Another addition was shortly after made to the proclamation of 1559, summoning every individual in the country to come forward and acknowledge the Spiritual Supremacy of Elizabeth.[2] But, though every means that great wealth and irresistible power could command was brought into play to break the spirit and shake the faith of the Irish people and clergy, they continued steadfast and loyal to the Church of their fathers; and of the episcopacy, only two, *Miler Magrath*, Bishop of Down, and *Hugh Curwin*, an Englishman, who had been appointed by Mary to the archiepiscopal See of Dublin in the room of Brown, proved recreant to their trusts and traitors to their God. The defection of these two bishops was, however, amply atoned for by the heroic constancy and glorious martyrdom of numerous others. *Dermot O'Hurley*, Archbishop of Cashel, was tied to a stake and his body covered with pitch, salt, oil, and sulphur; after which a slow fire was started, and managed with such a refinement of barbaric skill and civilized cruelty that the victim was made to endure the inhuman torture for hours without being permitted to expire. He was then cast into prison, but only to be brought forth the next day and strangled on the rack in Stephen's-green, Dublin, 1583.[3]

Patrick O'Hely, Bishop of Mayo, was stretched on a rack, his hands and feet broken with hammers, large needles driven violently under his nails; and, after enduring these barbarities for some time, was taken from the rack only to be hung from the limb of a neighbouring tree (1578).[4]

Richard Creach, Archbishop of Armagh, was carried to London and confined in the Tower. He was brought forth for trial, and confronted with a young lady, the daughter of the gaoler, who had been suborned to testify that he had attempted to outrage her person. Summoned to the witness-stand, the young woman, startled at the injustice of her purpose, and yielding to the promptings of her better nature, openly confessed that the good prelate was wholly innocent of the crime his enemies were desirous of fastening upon him. But these men cared not whether he was innocent or guilty; they sought only his life, and of that they would not be baffled. He was again

[1] *Spenser*, pp. 139-140, quoted by *Brenan*, L. c., p. 405. (Tr.)
[2] *Brenan*, L. c., p. 407. (Tr.)
[3] *Analecta sacra*, Appendix, p. 7. (Tr.)
[4] *Arthur a Monasterio*, In suo Martyrologio, quoted by Brenan, L. c., p. 415. (Tr.)

sent to the Tower, where he was chained like a wild beast; and, after undergoing every sort of suffering and privation for above four years, was finally poisoned, October 14, 1585.[1] The sufferings of these illustrious men, than whom Ireland has no greater saints in her long catalogue of martyrs, may serve as specimens to show what the Irish had to endure to keep the faith. The record of their lives is as proud a page as there is in the history of any people; and those historians who are assiduously ransacking the annals of the Spanish Inquisition for examples of inhuman atrocity can find them more conveniently, and certainly in a more aggravated form, by turning to the history of the Reformation in Ireland.[2]

To utterly root up and destroy the Catholic faith in Ireland, its seminaries and its colleges were closed by law; Catholic education, whether public or private, proscribed throughout the whole island; and those desiring to acquire a liberal education could do so only by either giving up their faith or crossing over to the Continent, where the munificent hospitality of strangers opened seats of learning for the Irish youth, which in some sort supplied the advantages furnished by those that had been closed against them at home.[3]

The accession of *James I.* to the throne of England led the Irish to hope that they might look for at least a scant measure of justice from the son of Mary Stuart, and count upon the free exercise of their religion during his reign. That this hope was fallacious they learned when James proclaimed an act of oblivion and indemnity, and excluded by name from the benefits of its provisions only "*Papists and assassins.*" A petition, carried to the king in 1603, begging freedom of religious worship for Catholics, was treated with contempt, and the bearers of it sent to prison in the Tower. On July 4, 1605, a royal ordinance was published, declaring all the enactments of the reign of Elizabeth in force, to which the king added that "no toleration shall ever be granted by us; and this," he went on to say, "we do for the purpose of cutting off all hope that any other religion shall ever be allowed, save that which is consonant to the *laws* and *statutes* of this realm."[4] This ordinance required "all

[1] *Analecta sacra*, De rebus Cath. Hib. de Processu Martyr., p. 46 sq. (Tr.)

[2] For particulars of the lives of these men, and many more, the reader is referred to *Brenan*. (Tr.)

[3] The Irish seminary at Lisbon, which was munificently endowed, was founded in 1595. Another was founded about the same time at Evora by Cardinal Henriquez. The Irish College of Douay was founded in 1596. Through the exertions of Christopher Cusack, a priest of the diocese of Meath, colleges were founded at Lisle, Antwerp, Tournay, and St. Omer. Seminaries were founded at Bordeaux, Toulouse, and Nantes, under the patronage of Anne of Austria. The Irish College on the hill of Ste. Geneviève, in Paris, was the gift of the French Government, and Baron de St. Just was its chief benefactor. In 1582, the College of Salamanca was founded by the States of Castile and Leon, under the patronage of Philip II. Baron George Sylveria founded the Irish College at Alcalá de Henares, which, being richly endowed, was the great nursery of Irish missionaries during the seventeenth century. *Brenan*, L. c., p. 423. (Tr.)

[4] *O'Daly*, Relatio Persec. Hib., p. 232. (Tr.)

Jesuits, seminary priests, and other priests whatsoever, to depart out of the kingdom of Ireland" before the ensuing 10th of December.[1]

During the reign of Elizabeth an unsuccessful attempt had been made to render the native Irish strangers in their own land and among their own people. It was proposed to send over English and Scotch colonists, who should take possession of the lands in various districts, and settle permanently in the country. The scheme was again taken up by James, to whom an excellent opportunity of carrying it into effect was presented when the property of the three powerful chiefs of Ulster, namely, Tyrone, Tyrconnel, and O'Doherty, escheated to the Crown. Their estates, it is said, included nearly the whole of the six northern counties of Cavan, Fermanagh, Armagh, Derry, Tyrone, and Tyrconnel, and embraced two millions of acres.[2] When insurrections did not break out with sufficient frequency to satisfy the greed of the avaricious agents of Government, it was pretended that the pacification of Ireland required a periodical revision of titles to the possession of land. It was not to be expected that in a country so long and so violently convulsed all titles should be without flaw; and it is certain that wherever defects existed, they did not escape the keen and practised eyes of the government lawyers. That the Lord Chief Justice and the Viceroy fully appreciated their opportunity, their zeal in hunting up defective titles, and their avidity in seizing the property for which no clear claim could be established, amply attest. In some instances, where the jury resolutely refused to do the bidding of the viceroy, they were summoned to Dublin, heavily fined, and cast into prison.[3]

These persecutions were kept up throughout the whole of the reign of James, and continued with increased violence under that of his successor, *Charles I.* (1625-1649). When this prince ascended the throne, it was hoped he would deal justly with the people of Ireland, and grant to them the same freedom of worship he allowed to his Catholic queen, Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV. of France. This would probably have been his policy had he not inherited the weak and halting character so peculiar to the House of Stuart, and been surrounded by wicked and bigoted advisers. Accordingly, when the Catholics began to practise their religion openly,

[1] *Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606-1608, Pref. 60-61; also *Burke's* Hibernia Dominicana, pp. 611-612. (Tr.)

[2] This project, known as the *Ulster Plantation*, was carried out with great skill. The lands to be "planted," were parcelled out into tracts of one thousand, fifteen hundred, and two thousand acres each, and given to Protestant settlers from England and Scotland, who were required to build castles or large houses, capable of being defended, in strong and commanding positions. The natives were permitted to take up their residence in the open country, under the control and at the mercy of the English and Scotch "undertakers and servitors," or capitalists and military officers. These latter were obliged to take the oath of supremacy, and to exclude any tenant not of British origin. *Lingard*, Hist. of England, London, 1849, Vol. IX., pp. 148, 149. *Killen*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, London, 1875, Vol. I., p. 482. (Tr.)

[3] *Thos. Moore*, Memoirs, Book I., ch. 7, notes 26-28. *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 29. (Tr.)

the Irish Protestant hierarchy, headed by the Archbishop Usher, took the alarm, and protested against a grant of graces, as they were called, which the king promised the Catholics in return for the payment of a certain sum of money. The Protestants went on to say that it would be "a grievous sin" to permit Catholics the "free exercise of their religion," because to do so would be to give the sanction of Government to superstition, idolatry, and heresy, and to barter for money souls redeemed by the blood of Christ.[1]

The king yielded to the pressure brought to bear upon him by the Protestant bishops of Ireland, and in 1629 the statutes against Catholics were once more revived.[2] Lord Falkland, who was then Viceroy of Ireland, unwilling to carry out the iniquitous and fraudulent policy of the Government, was recalled, and Lord Wentworth, afterwards *Earl of Strafford*, was appointed in his place in January, 1632. That Wentworth was a man of great ability and eminent talents there can be no doubt;[3] and there is just as little doubt that he prostituted in the service of the devil the splendid gifts he had received from God. Once the uncompromising champion of the rights of the people, he had now become the uncompromising champion of the claims of the king. Possessed of great courage and tenacity of purpose, and destitute of every humane feeling and conscientious scruple, he was appalled by no consideration of guilt in the conception of his measures, and was deterred by no obstacle in their execution. The leading and controlling principle of his government was that Ireland was a conquered country, and as such her inhabitants held their possessions by no title other than the goodwill of the king. A system of legalized robbery, under the specious name of an inquiry into the titles by which property was held, was begun and perfected by him, and under its operation the whole province of Connaught was declared the inheritance of the Crown, and parcelled out among the favourites of the court. This measure was the more atrocious, in that the king, by the contract of 1628 between himself and the landed proprietors of Ireland, had promised to make good by act of parliament the titles of the actual possessors

[1] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. IX., pp. 335, 336. *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 3, 4. *Brenan*, L. c., p. 453. (Tr.)

[2] The character of these bishops, who were so zealous in putting down what they were pleased to call "superstition," is given in a letter of remonstrance, addressed to the four archbishops by the king in April, 1630. "The clergy," he said, "were not so careful as they ought to be . . . in removing all pretences to scandal in their lives and conversation." "When livings fall vacant," "some bishops," "do either not dispose of them so soon as they should, *but do keep the profits in their own hands*, to the hindrance of God's service and the great offence of good people, or else they give them to young and mean men, which only bear the name, *reserving the greatest part of the benefice to themselves*." *Erlington's* Life of Usher, pp. 106-108.

Coyne, in his Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Bedell, pp. 34, 35, says Thomas Moygne, the Protestant predecessor of Bedell in the See of Kilmore, treated "all things spiritual and temporal belonging to the episcopacy" as if they "had been ordinarily vendible commodities;" even "*orders and livings*" being "sold to those that could pay the greatest prices." See *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 7, 8. (Tr.)

[3] *Thos. Moore*, L. c., chap. 8, p. 65.

of lands. In a parliament, which met in Dublin in 1634, many of whose members were selected either directly by the viceroy, or in compliance with his wishes, subsidies to the amount of £46,000 sterling were voted to the king; but when the question of confirming the promised Fifty-one Graces was raised, Strafford possessed sufficient influence to have the measure voted down. Among the leading causes that contributed to the success of this perfidious act were the threats and cajolery of the viceroy, the packing of the parliament, and the fact that the Fifty-one Graces nearly all were intended to correct grievances that weighed upon *Catholics* alone.[1]

At the moment when the king was threatened by his Scotch subjects, and at variance with the English parliament, the Irish came generously forward to relieve his necessities, and in return asked only that he should do them the scanty justice which was now perfidiously denied them. But to do justice to Ireland was no part of the policy of the English Government. The country was to be kept in a chronic state of rebellion for the benefit of thieves. "Rebellion," said *Leland*, a Protestant prebendary of Dublin, "is the goose that lays the golden eggs, and the lords chief justices will not be stupid enough to kill it."[2]

Such was the policy of the officials who governed Ireland, or rather who, under pretence of governing that country, did their best to aggravate the condition of the unfortunate inhabitants and keep them in a state of continuous revolt. It is not surprising, therefore, to learn that a formidable uprising of the people, under the lead of Roger O'Moore and Sir Phelim O'Neil, took place, October 23, 1641. At first the insurrection consisted only of detached bands, organized for the purpose of surprising and getting possession of garrisons and strongholds, and acting without a complete understanding with each other; but in the following year it became general over the whole island, and a systematic and effective plan of operations was agreed upon. Following the example of the Scots, who had successfully maintained their right to freedom of worship, a number of leading men from every city, town, and county, including the Catholic nobility and the prelates of the kingdom, met in national convention at Kilkenny early in 1642, and forming themselves into a *Confederation*, bound themselves "by solemn oath never to sheathe their swords until they saw their religion free, their kingdom constitutionally independent, and they themselves in possession of their natural and inalienable rights."[3] In compliance with a request from the Confederation, the bishops and clergy of Ireland assembled in a *National Synod at Kilkenny*, May 10, 1642, and unanimously resolved "that, whereas the Catholics of Ireland have taken up arms in defence of their religion, for the preservation of the king, . . . the security of their own lives, possessions, and liberty, we, on behalf of the Catholics,

[1] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. IX., pp. 336, 337. (Tr.) [2] Apud *Moore*, Bk. I., ch. 9, p. 73.
[3] *Brenan*, L. c., p. 454. (Tr.)

declare these proceedings to be most just and lawful. Nevertheless, if, in pursuit of these objects, any person or persons should be actuated by motives of avarice, malice, or revenge, we declare such person to be guilty of a grievous offence, and deservedly subject to the censures of the Church."[1]

The Synod ordained that there should be in each county and province a council composed of clerical and lay members, and a general or supreme council of similar composition, whose authority and jurisdiction the whole nation should recognize. These councils were primarily intended for the administration of the statute law, the authority of which was acknowledged, appeals being carried from the lower to the higher; but they also exercised executive functions.[2]

An oath was drawn up and administered to the members of the Confederation, binding those who took it to "bear true faith and allegiance" to King Charles; to defend their "prerogatives, estates, and rights;" to uphold "the fundamental laws of Ireland;" to maintain "the free exercise of the Roman Catholic faith and religion;" and to "obey and ratify all orders and decrees made, and to be made by the Supreme Council of the Confederate Catholics of this kingdom concerning the public cause."[3] It was further ordained that a *General Assembly* of the Confederate Catholics should be called. This body met *at Kilkenny*, October 24, 1642. Its members, although divided into two orders, the one consisting of the bishops and nobles, and the other of the representatives of the counties and towns, sat in the same chamber. The General Assembly, without taking the name, performed all the functions of a parliament, and announced that its business was "to consult of an order for their own affairs till his majesty's wisdom had settled the present troubles."[4] It nominated the members of the *Supreme Council*, and invested them with the authority of an executive government. They appointed sheriffs, coined money, carried on correspondence with foreign powers, had jurisdiction over civil officials and military officers, and were the ordinary representatives of national authority when the General Assembly was not convened, at the close of which they were changed. The General Assembly adopted as its motto the legend, "*Pro Deo, Rege, et Patria, Hiberni, Unanimes.*" The success of the arms of the Confederation was a surprise, even to the most sanguine. Nearly every important city in Ireland, Dublin excepted, fell into their hands; and, when in the full tide of victory, their terms were moderate and their demands just. The king appointed a Protestant nobleman, the Marquis of Ormond, to enter into negotiations with the Confederates. An armistice of twelve months, known as *The Cessation*, was agreed upon at Sigginstown, near Naas, on the 15th of September, 1643, by the

[1] *Brenan*, L. c., p. 455. *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. X., pp. 100-101. (Tr.)
[2] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. X., pp. 101-102. (Tr.)
[3] *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p 59, note 2. (Tr.)
[4] *T. D. McGee*, Attempt to establish the Reformation in Ireland, Boston, 1853, p. 111. (Tr.)

terms of which both parties were to retain possession of places respectively occupied by each, and the Catholics to hold the churches and ecclesiastical property they had regained, and to be unmolested in the free exercise of their religion. In the following year the armistice was prolonged for twelve months more, and when this period was about to expire, Charles, finding his condition in England well nigh hopeless, and having absolute and immediate need of both the money and the soldiers of Ireland to uphold his tottering throne, gave Earl Glamorgan a secret and informal, though binding commission, to cross the channel and negotiate a peace with the Confederation. Arrived at Kilkenny, Glamorgan met the Supreme Council, and concluded a treaty (August 25, 1645), by which the Catholics were granted freedom of worship, permitted to take possession of all churches not actually in the hands of the clergy of the Established Church, and secured in the enjoyment of many valuable civil, political, and social rights.[1]

A copy of the treaty fell into the hands of the Puritans, and Charles, to escape the odium the discovery caused, sent an address to parliament, disavowing the articles. Earl Glamorgan was arrested by Ormond, who, professing to believe the commission a forgery, cast him into prison. Ormond now drew up another treaty of Thirty Articles, in which he artfully allowed the claims for which the laymen contended, and denied those on which the clergy insisted. This treaty was objected to by the clergy and the better class of the laity, and was disagreeable to the Papal Nuncio, *John Baptist Rinuccini*, who had lately arrived in Ireland. It was, nevertheless, confirmed by the Supreme Council at Kilkenny, on the 28th of March, 1646.[2] The great bulk of the Irish people were indignant, believing that the advantages they had purchased so dearly had been bartered away, and they did not hesitate to apply epithets of traitor and perjurer to the members of the Supreme Council.[3] This event caused a split among the members of the Confederation, and the old Irish Catholics and the clergy began to be depressed, when their hopes were suddenly revived by the news of a brilliant victory gained by their leader, Owen Roe O'Neil, the Irish Fabius, over the Scottish commander, Monroe, at Benburb, June 5, 1646. With a force inferior to that of his enemy, O'Neil put him to an ignominious flight, captured his artillery, baggage, and provisions, and, while himself sustaining a loss of not above seventy men, left close upon three thousand of Monroe's dead upon the field of battle.[4] On the 11th of June, O'Neil proclaimed war on the Supreme Council, and in the August following a National Synod convened at Waterford, which issued a declaration to the effect

[1] *Lingard*, L. c., Vol. X., pp. 101-103. *Brenan*, L. c., pp. 455-456. (Tr.)

[2] While the treaty was signed on the above date, the documents were not exchanged till the 29th of July of the same year. (Tr.)

[3] *Lingard*, L. c., p. 164 sq. Vindiciæ Catholicorum Hiber, Auctore *Philopatre Irenæc*, l. I., quoted by *Brenan*. (Tr.)

[4] *Killen*, L. c , Vol. II., p. 74. (Tr.)

that "all and each of the Confederate Catholics who should adhere to the peace" of the Thirty Articles should be regarded as "perjurers," and that the assembled fathers would never consent to any treaty which did not guarantee unrestricted freedom of worship. By another decree, dated Kilkenny, October 5th of the same year, those adhering to the Peace were declared excommunicated and the Peace itself null and void, because it gave no satisfactory security for the free exercise of the Catholic religion.[1] This decree was virtually ratified by the General Assembly, which met at Kilkenny, January 7, 1647. In July of this year the Marquis of Ormond, conscious that the royal cause had become hopeless, surrendered Dublin to the Parliamentary army, and now having the undivided power of the enemy brought against them, and experiencing dissensions in their own ranks, the Confederates found it impossible to hold out, with any reasonable hope of success. The divisions among the Confederates were still further increased by a treaty of peace, entered into (May 20, 1648) between the Supreme Council and Lord Inchiquin, who had lately deserted the Puritan for the royal cause. The bishops protested in a declaration published at Kilkenny, but their protest proving ineffectual, on the following 27th of May they caused a document to be affixed to the gates of the Cathedral of St. Canice, in Kilkenny, excommunicating all the theologians who had approved the Peace and the members of the Supreme Council who had given it their assent. The excessive use of the censures of the Church has, at all times, worked evil, and the present instance is no exception. Heretofore the bishops, at least, had been practically a unit on every important question, carrying with them, by their harmony and uniform action, the whole body of the clergy and the better class of the laity. But now they split among themselves, some maintaining that the sentence of excommunication was valid; and others, their equals in learning and virtue, denying that, under the circumstances, there was any justification of the measure. In the meantime, Ormond returned to Ireland, and on the 17th of January, 1649, a treaty of peace, containing thirty-five articles, was ratified and published by the General Assembly at Kilkenny. This was the last official act of the Confederation. A few days later the king ended his life on the scaffold, and on the 15th of the following August, Cromwell landed in Ireland, and immediately commenced the subjugation of the country. After a short siege, he took Drogheda by storm, and even the Protestant Killen admits that thousands, including "priests, monks, citizens, and soldiers,"[2] were put to the sword. And the fate of Drogheda was the fate of every city and town that did not surrender at the first summons to the Puritan tyrant, who, holding the Bible in one hand, slaughtered innocent victims with the other. Limerick was taken in October, 1651, after a protracted siege, and Cromwell declared confiscated nearly all the lands belonging to Catholics in Ireland, and divided them among his soldiers

[1] *Brenan*, L. c., p. 459. (Tr.)

[2] *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 119. (Tr.)

and a class called "adventurers," who advanced money to pay the army. Twenty thousand were transported to the West Indies, and many thousand more, chiefly females, to the American colonies. Those who were not sent abroad were shut up in the western province of Connaught. Preparations for the settlement of Connaught by the Catholics were completed by the year 1653, and, by an act of the English parliament, all who were found after the date of May 1, 1654, on the eastern side of the Shannon, were liable to the penalty of *death*. British settlements, extending to a distance of several miles, were planted along the sea-coast and the western bank of the Shannon, and composed of men long trained to military service. Judging by human standards, the Catholic religion was as good as extinct in Ireland. This barbarous proscription was applicable to all the land-owners of the island who could not prove that during the whole time of the civil war they had shown a "constant good affection to the cause of the parliament." It must also be borne in mind that Connaught had been made desolate by the civil wars, and that those of the nobility who could trace their ancestry back to the dim mists where history begins, and who had been accustomed to move about in noble palaces and enjoy all the luxuries of life, could not find a dwelling fit for a human being to abide in. Famine supervened to add to the miseries of war and persecution, and historians, Protestant and Catholic alike, agree in stating that no pen can adequately portray the hardships and sufferings which this poor but gallant people underwent for religion's sake. Of a hierarchy of twenty-six prelates, three only were permitted to remain;[1] and of the priests, those who were not martyred were commanded to go into exile, only twenty-eight days being given them to quit the kingdom.

Cromwell went to meet his Judge, September 3, 1658, and two years later *Charles II.* made his public entry into London. It is asserted that the new king had promised to deal justly with the Catholics of Ireland; but, if such promise had ever been made, it was soon forgotten. The Puritans, who were in possession of their lands, began now to represent them as fomenters of dissension, disturbers of the public peace, subjects of a foreign potentate, and incapable of loyalty to the Crown. It was the old strategy, and was received by the enemies of the Church with as much credulity in that age as it has been in our own. To correct these misrepresentations, a number of the Catholic leaders met in Dublin in 1661, and drew up a "*Remonstrance*," addressed to the king, in which they stated that they felt themselves "obliged, under pain of sin, to obey his majesty in all civil and temporal affairs, as much as any other of his majesty's subjects, and as the laws and rules of government in this kingdom did require at their hands."[2] The Roman Catholic nobility and gentry of Ireland, for

[1] *Darcy McGee*, L. c., p. 130. In the year 1653 there was only one bishop in the whole island. *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 146. (Tr.)

[2] *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 142. (Tr.)

the most part, were unanimous in their approval of the sentiments set forth in the Remonstrance; while the clergy, on the other hand, protested against it as containing sentiments disrespectful to the Holy See and propositions condemned by Popes Paul V. and Innocent X.[1]

It soon became evident that the Remonstrants received their inspiration from Ormond, the Lord Lieutenant, and that his aim was to divide the Catholic clergy and people among themselves. A synod was convened in Dublin, June 11, 1666, to consider the questions raised, and six days later, unanimously rejected the Remonstrance. They, however, drew up another, in which, while omitting the passages disrespectful to the Holy See, they embodied the same expressions of loyalty set forth in the one of 1661. This action gave great offence to Ormond, and, in consequence, the bishops who had come to Dublin again left the country. At the close of the year 1668, there were only two prelates in the island.[2] In the month of May of the year 1670, *Lord Berkeley* became viceroy, and during the four years of his administration the Catholics enjoyed a season of comparative exemption from persecution. Bishops returned; provincial and diocesan synods were held; Catholics occupied positions of public trust and honour; churches and chapels were again opened; and the old faith began once more to flourish in the land. But this interval of peace was only the stillness of the calm that precedes the storm. In 1673, the Puritans, who were in a majority in the House of Commons, forced the king to recall Lord Berkeley, whose justice and humanity in the government of Ireland excited the indignation of these fierce zealots. The "Declaration of Indulgence to Dissenters," granted three years previously, was revoked, and the "Test Act" again enforced. Those refusing to take the oath of supremacy, to deny transubstantiation, and "to receive the Sacrament" according to the rite of the Established Church, were declared incapable of holding either civil or military office.[3] Catholics were forbidden to reside in corporate towns; bishops and others exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction by the Pope's authority were commanded to quit the kingdom; convents were dissolved, and all priests banished.[4] In 1677, Lord Essex, who had succeeded to Berkeley in the viceroyalty of Ireland,

[1] *Brenan*, L. c., pp. 478-480.
The passages to which exception was taken read as follows: "And that, notwithstanding any power or pretension of the Pope or the See of Rome, or any sentence or declaration of what kind or quality soever, given, or to be given, by the Pope, his predecessors or successors, or by any authority, spiritual or temporal, proceeding or derived from him or his See, against your majesty or royal authority, we will still acknowledge and perform, to the uttermost of our abilities, our loyalty and true allegiance to your majesty. And we openly disclaim and renounce all foreign power, be it either papal or princely, spiritual or temporal, inasmuch as it may seem able, or shall pretend, to free, discharge, or absolve us from this obligation, or give us leave or license to raise tumults, bear arms, or offer any violence to your majesty's person or royal authority, or to the State or Government." This was not the production of the Irish leaders, but an exact copy of the Declaration presented by the South Britons to Charles I. in 1640. (Tr.)

[2] *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 146. (Tr.)

[3] *McGee*, L. c., p. 143. (Tr.)

[4] *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 150. (Tr.)

was recalled, and Ormond again appointed in his place. The news of the "*Popish Plot*" reached the viceroy in the course of the following year, and, while he ridiculed the clumsy invention in private, he made it a pretext in public for fresh persecutions against the Catholics. It was pretended that the "*Plot*" extended to Ireland; and, although, as the Protestant *Killen* candidly avows, "the evidence against the accused possessed transparent marks of falsehood," *Peter Talbot*, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and *Lord Montgarret*, both far advanced in years, the latter being eighty-one, and both sinking under disease and infirmity, were dragged to prison, where they ended their days.

Oliver Plunket, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, who, *Killen* tells us, "was an ecclesiastic of blameless morals and pacific temper," but who, "according to the testimony" of two friars and an apostate priest, whom he had punished for their vices, "was a most desperate revolutionist," was of so exalted a character that the fear of not being able to get even a Protestant jury to convict him in Ireland induced his persecutors to send him to London, where he was tried at Westminster, and sentenced to be hanged, embowelled, and quartered, "according to law." He was executed at Tyburn, July 1, 1681. Those who bore false witness against him all ended their days miserably.[1]

These persecutions continued until the accession of *James II.*, in 1685, when the Irish Catholics again looked forward in the hope of seeing them suspended and their rights restored. They were not disappointed. Lord Clarendon was sent as viceroy to Ireland in 1686, with instructions to grant freedom of worship to Catholics; to remove or disregard their civil disabilities; and to admit them equally with Protestants to offices of State. The reform of the army was intrusted to Richard Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnel, and brother to the late Archbishop of Dublin. Protestant soldiers were removed, and Catholics appointed to fill their places. These changes alarmed the Protestants, and their fears were still further aroused by the information that Talbot had gone to England for the purpose of pressing the repeal of the Act of Settlement, and by his appointment to the government of Ireland in the room of Clarendon, in whose recall he had been chiefly instrumental. Affairs were in this condition when James, driven from his throne by William of Orange, passed over to France (1688). The disasters that overtook the king in England did not shake the loyalty of his Catholic subjects in Ireland. To them his cause was identical with their own. From the reign of Henry VIII. down, they had borne sufferings and death for their faith; he had granted freedom of worship. They had laboured under civil and political disqualifications; these he had removed. They had been robbed of their lands; he had shown an inclination to repeal the Acts of Settlement. These and other considerations attached them to James; but both their hopes and his were extinguished

[1] See his life, by the *Rev. Dr. Croly*, of Maynooth, Dublin.

by the decisive battle of the *Boyne*, July 2, 1690. James quitted Ireland immediately after this disastrous and to him disgraceful engagement, but the Irish Catholics fought on for a year longer. Their defeat at the battle of *Aughrim*, July 12, 1691, which was followed on the 13th of the following month by the capitulation of *Limerick*, destroyed all possibility of successful resistance, and made the authority of William supreme over the whole island. By the Treaty of Limerick it was expressly stipulated that Catholics should be obliged to take only the oath binding them "to bear faithful and true allegiance to their Majesties William and Mary;" and yet in the year following an oath was drawn up and presented for their acceptance, in which they were called upon to deny the dogma of "transubstantiation" in "the Lord's Supper;" and to declare that "the invocation of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as now used in the Church of Rome, are damnable and idolatrous." An "oath of abjuration" was also drawn up, which went on to say that no foreign prince or prelate "hath any jurisdiction, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm."[1]

By the Treaty of Limerick the Irish Catholics were secured in the enjoyment of "their goods and chattels," "their estates of freehold and inheritance," together with all their interests and immunities; and yet by an act of the Irish parliament of 1695, anyone known to have sent his child to the Continent, to be brought up in the Catholic faith, was incapacitated from prosecuting suits at law, from receiving any legacy or deed of gift, and was condemned to "forfeit" all his goods and chattels and "all his hereditaments, rents, annuities, offices, and estates of freehold."[2] A Protestant heiress, who married a Catholic, was punished by loss of her inheritance.[3] In the parliament of 1697, an act was passed requiring all Catholic archbishops,

[1] *McGee*, L. c., p. 168. *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 177 et seq.

During this and the preceding reigns, the clergymen of the Protestant Church in Ireland do not appear to have been self-denying, saintly men, or to have corrected in their own lives faults of which they complained so loudly in those of others. Speaking of the "Irish Episcopal Church," immediately after the Restoration, *Killen* says: "In the selection of the new dignitaries, political services and family connections had generally more influence than piety or learning. Instead of devoting themselves to the spiritual duties of their office, and thus seeking to remove the odium which had so long rested on their order, most of the *bishops* still continued to give offence by their covetousness, secularity, and ambition." One who subsequently became an archbishop was notorious "for his penuriousness and indolence." Another, who subsequently became Primate and Chancellor of Ireland, seems to have merited his promotion by his avaricious greed. He "was not satisfied with three sees," but, on "the groundless plea that he could find no clergymen," appropriated for three years the "incomes" "of six parishes," leaving the Protestant parishioners in the interval "without a ministry." Neither did these holy men, who came to bring the pure light of the Gospel to a benighted and superstitious people, appear to improve as time went on. Mary, writing to William just after the battle of the Boyne, tells him to "take care of the Church in Ireland. Everybody agrees," she says, "that it is the worst in Christendom." We are told that Thomas Hacket, the Protestant Bishop of Down and Connor from 1672 to 1694, traded "in benefices with unblushing effrontery. The livings in his gift were sold to the highest bidder. For twenty years he was never within the bounds of his diocese, etc." And so the list of these good and pure Reformers goes on to the end of the chapter. *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 130 and 182-183. (Tr.)

[2] The 7th of William III., chap. IV., s. I. (Tr.)

[3] *Ibid.*, s. I. (Tr.)

bishops, vicars-general, deans, Jesuits, monks, friars, and all Catholics exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to quit the kingdom before the 1st of May, 1698, and should any return, they were declared subject to the penalties of high treason.[1] Between the years 1696 and 1699, over nine hundred priests were banished the kingdom, and the two or three hundred who remained were obliged to hide away in the caverns of the earth or the pestilential morasses of the open country.

The old scheme for robbing the Catholics by issuing a commission to inquire into defective titles was again revived, and under its operation 1,060,792 acres were forfeited to the Crown, in addition to the 10,636,837 already seized.[2] At the death of William, the Catholics, who only a century before had held in fee three-fourths of the soil of Ireland, did not now own above "one-sixth part" of that amount.[3]

The twelve years of Queen Anne's reign (1702-1714) form one of the darkest epochs of the history of persecution in Ireland. The enactments of the Irish parliament of 1703 cannot be equalled in inhuman atrocity and a satanic disregard for the rights of mankind by the records of any legislative body that ever disgraced a civilized world. They are absolutely without a parallel. One of them, entitled, "An act to prevent Popish priests from coming into the kingdom," declared guilty of high treason and subject to its penalties, all who should "harbour, relieve, conceal, or entertain" Catholic priests; and "any mayor, justice of the peace, or other officer," who was proved to be negligent in enforcing the law, was liable to fine of one hundred pounds. Another, entitled, "a bill to prevent the further growth of Popery," consisting of twenty-eight sections, which received the royal assent, March 4, 1704, is the most elaborate digest of legislative persecution that was ever framed.[4]

[1] The 9th of William III., chap. I. (Tr.)

[2] The proceeds from the confiscated lands were employed to defray the expenses of the war of 1688. A new class of adventurers were thus introduced into the country, consisting chiefly of Dutch and German Protestants. Their descendants in Munster are known to this day as "*Palatines*." *McGee*, L. c., p. 170. (Tr.)

[3] *Bedford's* Compendious and Impartial View of the Law affecting the Roman Catholics, London, 1829, p. 15. (Tr.)

[4] The following is a summary of this bill, given by the Protestant historian, *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 194, 195: "It provides that any persuading a Protestant to embrace Popery, and every such pervert (!) shall incur the penalty of præmunire; that, if the eldest son of a Popish landlord conforms to the Established Church, the father shall hold the estate only as a tenant for life, whilst the son shall be proprietor in fee; that the orphan children of Popish parents shall be entrusted to Protestant guardians, and brought up in the Protestant religion; that any Papist undertaking such guardianship shall be liable to a penalty of five hundred pounds; that no Papist shall be at liberty to purchase lands for a longer term than thirty-one years; . . . that a Papist, who has inherited from a Protestant any estate, tenement, or hereditament in fee, and who does not conform to the Established Church, shall not be entitled to continue in the enjoyment of the property; that a Papist, who is the owner of a freehold, shall not have the power to bequeath it to his eldest son; that at his death it shall be split up in equal portions among all his male children; but that the law of primogeniture shall be maintained should the eldest son, within three months after his father's death, produce a certificate from the Protestant bishop of the diocese, stating that he belongs to the Church as established by law; that no papist shall be capable of voting at an election for a member of parliament until he

By a third act of the parliament, every secular priest was obliged, under penalty of banishment, to come forward before the 24th of June, 1704, register his name, age, the place of his abode, the name of his parish, the date of his ordination, the bishop by whom he was ordained, and to give security that he would not pass beyond the borders of the county in which he resided. By another clause of the same act, any priest who might apostatize had the sum of twenty pounds a year settled on him.[1]

The aim of this enactment was obvious. Heretofore it had been difficult to apprehend or convict priests, but now it was only necessary, when occasion required, to send police to the designated places of abode, arrest and execute the penalties of the law upon the poor victims, whose confessions in their written registrations were ample evidence against them. These laws were so revolting to the feelings of our common nature that great difficulty was experienced in putting them in execution. The offices of the public informer were required, and there is no character so contemptibly odious to Irish instincts and Irish honour. Hence it was necessary to give those performing such offices a diploma of good conduct, and it was accordingly declared "that the prosecuting and informing against Papists was an honourable service, and that all magistrates who neglected to execute these laws were betrayers of the liberties of the kingdom."[2]

It should seem that the laws against the Irish Catholics were now sufficiently severe to satisfy any human being not inspired by satanic hatred against the Church of Christ. But the *Earl of Wharton*, the viceroy, did not think so; and in a speech, which he delivered in the Irish parliament of 1709, he so wrought upon the fears and the bigotry of the members, if, indeed, they needed any such incentive, that they resolved that many "Popish bishops had lately come into the kingdom," who "had presumed to continue the succession of the Romish priesthood, and that their return was owing to a defect in the laws." They accordingly passed a new act "to prevent the further growth of Popery," providing that the children of Catholics, by conforming to the Protestant worship, might compel their parents, through the Court of Chancery, to make known the full amount of their property, and to provide the young apostates with a suitable maintenance; that no one should be regarded as a Protestant who had not taken the oath of abjuration and received the Sacrament after the form of the Established Church; and that anyone informing on an archbishop, bishop, or vicar-general, should receive a reward of fifty pounds; for a regular the reward was twenty pounds, and for a school-master ten pounds; these sums to be levied off the Catholic inhabitants of the county in which the person informed on resided.[3] In 1710, those priests who

has taken the oath of allegiance and abjuration; and that all persons assembling at St. Patrick's Purgatory, Lough Derg, shall incur a fine of ten shillings each, and, in default of payment, receive a public whipping." (Tr.)

[1] *Brenan*, L. c., p. 549. *Killen*, L. c., pp. 195, 196. (Tr.)

[2] *Irish Commons, Journal*, Vol. III., p. 319. (Tr.)

[3] *Brenan*, L. c., p. 550. *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 203. (Tr.)

had complied with the law of registration were commanded to come forward before the 25th of March, and take the oath of abjuration, under penalty of banishment, and, should they return to the country, they were declared guilty of high treason. Anne, the last and the worst of the contemptible Stuarts, died on the 1st of August, 1714, and the character of the penal code of her reign cannot be better described than in the words of Edmund Burke. "It was," says this distinguished statesman, "a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man."

On the accession of *George I.* of the House of Brunswick to the English throne, the Tories were driven from office. The king was not naturally intolerant, but this element, which had formed so conspicuous a part in the characters of the late rulers of England, was abundantly supplied by the persecuting spirit of the Whigs, who had lately come to power. In 1715, the Scotch raised the standard of revolt in favour of the *Pretender;* and, while the Catholics took no part in the quarrel, they were as violently persecuted as if they had. Catholic nobles were hurried to prison; churches and chapels were closed throughout the kingdom; priests were seized at the altars, where they were officiating, and the usual bribes were offered to informers. The bulk of the execrable set of miscreants, known as *priest catchers*, were Jews, who pretended to be converts to Catholicity, and assumed the dress and sometimes simulated the functions of priests.[1]

In 1719, the Presbyterian Dissenters obtained an Act of Toleration; but no corresponding concession was granted to the Roman Catholics. Under the pretext that the Catholics were at heart attached to the Pretender, and only awaited a favourable opportunity to give him their support, they were visited with additional penalties by the Irish Parliaments of 1716 and 1723.[2]

About this time secret agents from the French Jansenists were sent into Ireland, and books containing their errors were distributed over the country. Pope Clement XI., taking alarm at these efforts to undermine the faith of the Irish people, sent, through *Vicentius Santini*, his internuncio at Brussels, a warning to the Irish bishops, accompanied with a request that they would in some public way declare their acceptance of the Bull "*Unigenitus*." Each member of the Irish hierarchy sent in reply letters expressive of the attachment of themselves, their priests, and their people to the Holy See and its teachings; and assured the Holy Father that, though oppressed and despised, they would never cease to preserve with the Head of the Church "*unity of spirit in the bond of peace*," and that no such evasive terms as "*religious silence and the question of right and fact*" had been adopted by them.

[1] *Brenan*, L. c., Vol. II., pp. 551, 552. (Tr.)
[2] The 2nd of George I., chap. X. *Ibid.*, chap. XIX., s. 7. (Tr.)

In the early part of the reign of *George II.* (1727-1760), a pretended fear of the influence of Catholics caused the passage of an act depriving them altogether of the privilege of voting for members of parliament or the magistrates of "any city or corporate town;"[1] and by another act of the same parliament, Roman Catholics were forbidden to practise as barristers or solicitors.[2] At the time of this enactment, very nearly all the members of distinction belonging to the legal profession in Ireland were Roman Catholics, and they yielded reluctantly to the command of the law obliging them either to give up their profession or prove apostates to their God. Under the circumstances, it is not wonderful that some of them professed Protestantism openly, while they were at heart loyal to the old faith. It was noticed that, when about to be admitted to the Bar, persons, who until then, had practised the Catholic religion, and who were now base enough to stultify their consciences for a paltry gain, never made very zealous or even fair Protestants. Thus far they had been obliged to produce only a certificate, stating that they had received the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church, as by law established either in England or Ireland. But an act was now passed, requiring that anyone demanding admission to the Bar should prove, on satisfactory evidence, given under oath, that he had been a Protestant during *the two previous years;* and, should he neglect to educate his children under fourteen years of age at the time of his admission, or those born to him after this date, he was condemned to forfeit his certificate.

In 1733, another act was passed, making this law still more stringent, and disqualifying any convert to Protestantism from practising in the courts of law who should allow his Roman Catholic wife to educate her children in the Catholic faith.[3]

In 1743, the rumour of an intended French invasion furnished another pretext for fresh persecutions, and so violent was the feeling against Catholics, that one member of the privy council advocated an indiscriminate massacre of the whole body. A proclamation was published, which, in addition to the sums already set upon the heads of ecclesiastics, offered a reward of one hundred and fifty pounds for the conviction of a bishop or archbishop, fifty pounds for a priest, and two hundred pounds for anyone who might harbour or give protection to a bishop.[4]

Churches were again closed all over the country, and so vigilant and energetic were the officers of the law that it seemed impossible to escape them. Driven from their churches, the priests would gather the faithful about them on some green hillside or in a secluded nook of a pleasant valley, and there, on a rude altar of stone in the temple of nature, offer up the everlasting sacrifice to nature's God. Such are Ireland's witnesses to the faith.

[1] The 1st of George II., chap. IX., s. 7. (Tr.)
[2] *Ibid.*, chap. XX. (Tr.)
[3] The 7th of George II., chaps. V. and VI. (Tr.)
[4] *Brenan*, L. c., p. 561. (Tr.)

During the long period of persecution from the reign of Henry VIII. to that of George II., the Irish Catholic bishops were continuously driven from their dioceses, and forced to seek an asylum in some country on the Continent. What was for so long a necessity, by repetition grew into a practice; and the continued and protracted absences of the chief pastors from their flocks was beginning to work so much harm that Pope Benedict XIV., in a beautiful letter, dated August 15, 1741, reminded them of their duty. He implored them, as he said, with tears in his eyes, to remedy the evil, and told them plainly that if the word of God was not preached, the Sacraments not administered, if morals were corrupted, and the people in ignorance and error, they, and they alone, were responsible.[1]

From this time forth the hardships of the Irish began to grow less galling and oppressive; still one more effort was made by James Hamilton, not only to revive all the inhuman legislation of the reign of Queen Anne, but to add other statutes, which, if less atrocious, were more cunningly devised and more maliciously wicked. In 1756, a bill was introduced by him in parliament, providing for the registration of all Catholic priests, and also requiring that only one priest should be allowed to each parish; that he should be appointed by the grand jury, and sanctioned by the privy council and lord lieutenant; that he should give information of all priests residing in his parish; and that he should not attempt to make converts. Another clause provided for the expulsion from the country of all bishops, dignitaries, and friars. The bill, though defeated, was again introduced in the following year and passed, but the king refused to put his name to it, and from this act dates the definite mitigation of the penal laws in Ireland.[2]

The Duke of Bedford, who was appointed lord lieutenant in the autumn of 1757, signified that he would pursue a policy friendly to Ireland, and that the inhabitants might count upon his good services in redressing their grievances and satisfying their just demands. The Roman Catholic clergy of Dublin immediately expressed their acknowledgments in an *Exhortation* to the people, in which, after thanking the Government for its "large charities" during a recent season of scarcity, they called upon the people to show their gratitude to their civil governors "by an humble, peaceable, and obedient behaviour;" to live virtuously, to abstain from crimes and misdeeds of every sort, and "to avoid riots and tumults," and thus "prove themselves good citizens and pious Christians."[3]

The moment seemed opportune to take some definite steps towards ameliorating the political condition of the Catholics of Ireland, and accordingly an association was formed for this purpose. The members, who were exclusively of the commercial and citizen classes, the

[1] *Brenan*, p. 557 sq.; yet the date of Benedict XIV.'s letter is not August 1, 1746, given by *Brenan*, but August 15, 1741, as is proved by the *Bullar.*, ed. Venet., 1768, p. 29. (Tr.)
[2] *Brenan*, L. c., pp. 562, 563. (Tr.) [3] *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 275. (Tr.)

nobility and gentry having refused to join them, generally met at the Elephant Tavern, in Essex-street. After the usual preliminaries, they gave aim and purpose to their labours by appointing the famous Dr. Curry, the hardly less famous Charles O'Conor, and Mr. Wyse, a Waterford merchant, a sort of executive committee for the association. The first work of the committee was to make a statement or declaration of principles, a task which they committed to *Dr. O'Keefe*, Bishop of Kildare. The document was chiefly confined to proving for the thousandth time that Catholics may be good and loyal subjects, and that their Church teaches no doctrine incompatible with civil allegiance.

An opportunity of testing these principles soon came. When, in 1759, the French threatened a descent upon the coast of Ireland, the Roman Catholic committee sent an address to the Lord Lieutenant, in which they professed themselves "ready and willing, to the utmost of their abilities, to assist in supporting his Majesty's Government against all hostile attempts whatsoever."[1] The address was graciously received, and the Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, where it was read, expressed the extreme satisfaction which the evidence of the loyalty of the Roman Catholics afforded that body. On the accession of *George III.* (1760-1782) to the English throne, the committee prepared and forwarded to that monarch a congratulatory address, in which they reminded him that they were under certain disabilities, not imposed upon other citizens, and expressed the hope that they "might not be left incapable of promoting the general welfare and prosperity."[2] In 1767, public prayers were offered up, for the first time since the Revolution, in all the Catholic Churches of Ireland for the sovereign and the royal family. Concessions, however, came slowly and grudgingly. By an act of the Irish Parliament of 1774, the only oath to be required of Irish Roman Catholics was one expressive of allegiance to the House of Hanover, and denying that the Pope of Rome "had or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm."[3]

The tone and form of address used heretofore towards Catholics in official documents began now to be more respectful. When they had not been hostilely termed "the common enemy," they had been contemptuously styled "Papists;" but in an act of parliament of the year 1778, by which their condition was greatly improved, they were designated "Roman Catholics."[4] Among the supporters of this act was the celebrated Henry Grattan, a name ever dear to the Irish people.

The fear inspired in England by the breaking-out of the war of American Independence had probably more to do with the concessions now granted to Irish Catholics than

[1] Charles O'Conor is the reputed author of the address. See *Mitchell's* Hist. of Ireland, p. 80. (Tr.)

[2] *Plowden* I., Appendix, p. 276. (Tr.) [3] *Killen*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 296. (Tr.)

[4] This act is the 17th and 18th of George III., chap. XIX. (Tr.)

any fair-minded purpose of doing them justice. The privilege granted by the Parliament of 1771 of obtaining a lease of sixty-one years on land reclaimed from unwholesome bogs, and situated at least a mile from any town, and the permission given by the Parliament of 1774 of taking an oath of allegiance, which did not contain a direct denial of the Catholic faith, cannot be regarded as either very gracious or very generous concessions. Neither can the Act, passed in 1778, permitting Roman Catholics to take leases for 999 years; making the conditions of the sale and inheritance of their lands the same as those enjoyed by Protestants; declaring them capable of holding and using any estates that might be conveyed or devised to them; relieving parents of the burden of supporting a wayward or wicked child, who might go over to the Established Church; and abolishing the law provided for the reversion of a Catholic father's estate to his eldest son, should the latter give up the Catholic faith, be considered as more than satisfying the demands of strict justice, and indicating on the part of some a growing disposition to be fair. For it is well to remember that this act did not pass the Irish House of Commons until after a protracted and severe struggle. The same may be said of every concession that followed. As years went on, the rigours of the penal laws were gradually relaxed. In 1782, an unsuccessful effort was made to repeal the law passed in 1745, declaring invalid marriages celebrated by Catholic priests between Catholics and Protestants. But in the same year the right of Catholics to purchase lands in perpetuity, to teach schools attended by children of their own faith, and to act as guardians to Roman Catholic children, was recognized.[1] Priests were also permitted to celebrate Mass publicly, provided the building in which they celebrated had neither a steeple nor a bell, a prohibition which was evaded by suspending a bell from a neighbouring tree.[2] Other disabilities were removed by the Relief Act of 1792,[3] and a petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, presented to George III., January 2, 1793, by a delegation sent to London for the purpose, was followed in the same year by a second Act of Relief, which was passed through both Houses of the Irish Parliament more in obedience to the will of the Government than from inclination on the part of those who gave it their support. By this Act the Catholics were exempted from attending the service of the Established Church on Sundays; declared qualified to hold all offices and places of trust and profit under the Crown, whether military or civil, except those of Lord Lieutenant, Lord Deputy, and Lord Chancellor, and seats in Parliament; and admitted to the elective franchise,[4] of which, as Mr. Burke remarked, there were very few to take advantage, "because almost all the old freeholders had been worn out during the reign of the penalties."[5]

We have seen that when Catholic seats of learning in Ireland were closed, and the most rigid laws existed against opening Catholic schools of any sort, Irish priests and Irish gentlemen passed over to the Continent, and by their zeal for religion and their love of the sciences and arts, which had been banished from their own land, so interested strangers in their behalf, that seminaries and colleges were established in almost every country of the whole of Europe, through whose hospitable doors the exiled Irish student entered in pursuit of the learning which a nation, boasting of its enlightenment, denied him in his own home and in the land of his fathers. The Annals of the Four Masters were arranged at one of these colleges, and McGeoghegan's History of Ireland written at another. O'Connell studied at St. Omer's, and Luke Wadding and Dr. Doyle at Cambrai. All the men distinguished in Irish Catholic history for nearly three-quarters of a century previously to the date of the Relief Act were educated on the Continent.[6]

Dr. O'Keefe, Bishop of Kildare († 1787), has the honour of having founded *Carlow College*, the first Catholic college in Ireland since the Reformation. It was not opened for the reception of students until the year 1793.[7]

The closing of the Irish colleges in France by the breaking out of the Revolution, and their declining condition in other countries, caused the Irish hierarchy to cast about for

---

[1] The 21st and 22nd of George III., chaps. XXIV. and LXII.

[2] *Coyan*, I. 144. (Tr.)

[3] The 32nd of George III., chap. XXI. (Tr.)

[4] The 33rd of George III., chap. XXI. (Tr.)

[5] *Correspondence*, Vol. III., pp. 363, 364, London, 1844. (Tr.)

[6] Besides the colleges already mentioned at page 353, there were those of St. Anthony (1617), the Collegium Pastorale Hibernorum (1624), and the Irish Dominican College (1659) at Louvain. At Rome, Fr. L. Wadding, assisted by the Barberini family, founded (1625) the Irish Franciscan College of St. Isidore, and he also persuaded Cardinal Ludovisi, "Protector of Ireland," to found (1628) an Irish secular college, which was under the direction of the Jesuits, and of which Oliver Plunket was a student

[7] *Brenan*, L. c., p. 567. (Tr.)

some means of training their seminarists at home. It was thought necessary, under the circumstances, to modify somewhat the original purpose of Carlow College, and to admit to its halls students training for the priesthood. But this provision was inadequate. In February, 1794, the Irish hierarchy presented an address to the Lord Lieutenant, in which they state that the education given at the University of Dublin, while it is excellent for the purposes for which it was designed, is by no means suited to ecclesiastics, who require a special training of their own; and they therefore beg that his excellency may be pleased to recommend to his majesty the policy of establishing and endowing a college for the education of aspirants to the priesthood. The petition was favourably received, and in 1795 an Act was passed establishing a *college at Maynooth*, and an endowment of eight thousand pounds for the current yearly expenses was granted.[1]

To say that from the breaking out of the Reformation until the French Revolution "there was no law for Catholics in Ireland,"[2] is to state a sad but stern truth. It was only too manifest that in the interval those in power had no wish to do justice to Ireland, and no interest in making its inhabitants peaceable and contented citizens. The atrocities which preceded and caused the rebellion of 1798 abundantly prove this statement.[3] That the acts of injustice perpetrated by England upon Ireland were real and weighty national grievances, is shown by the fact that Protestants, as well as Catholics, participated in the rebellion. The people were driven to desperation, and the principles of the French Revolution, which were diffused among them chiefly through the works of the infidel, Thomas Paine, hastened the uprising. The Catholic hierarchy and clergy, as a body, exerted all their power and influence to quell the popular passions. The bill for the *Union of Ireland with England*, which received the royal assent on the 1st of August, 1800, and went into effect on the 1st of January, 1801, was the sad result of this rebellion. By this bill the existence of Ireland as a distinct nation came to an end.

If the penal laws had been executed with the rigour contemplated by their framers and enactors, the preservation of the Catholic religion in Ireland would have been, judging by human standards, a verification of the words of our Lord, speaking of his Church, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against thee."

§ 332. *Protestantism in France.*

Histoire ecclésiastique des Eglises réformées au royaume de France (par *Th. de Bèze*), Anvers, 1580, 3 vols. (to 1563). *Maimbourg*, Hist. du Calvinisme, etc. Hist. of the League, from the French, by *Dryden*, Lond., 1684, 8vo. *Serrani* (Reformed Preacher of Geneva, † 1598), Commentarius de statu relig. et reipub. in regno Galliæ, Gen., 1572 sq., 5 vols. *Thuanus*, Hist. sui temp. *Berthier*, Hist. de l'église Gall., Paris, 1749, 4to. **Lacretelle*, Hist. de France pendant les guerres de religion, Paris, 1814-1816, 4 vols. *Peignot*, Livre des singularités, Dijon, 1841. †*Capefigue*, Hist. de la réforme, de la ligue et du règne de Henri IV., Paris, 1834, 4 vols. †**France and the Reformation* (The Catholic, 1842, April, May, and June numbers). †*Boost*, Hist. of the Reformation in France (1547-1844), Augsburg, 1844. *Schmidt*, Hist. of France, Hamburg, 1835 sq., Vols. 2nd and 3rd. *Ranke*, Civil Wars and Monarchy in France in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Stuttg., 1852 sq., 5 vols.; London, 1852 (Complete Works, Vols. 8-13); as far

[1] This sum was increased in 1806 to thirteen thousand pounds, but again reduced in 1808 to the original grant. (Tr.)

[2] *Moore*, Bk. II., ch. 11, p. 277.

[3] *Ibid.*, Bk. II., ch. 12, notes 90, 91.

as this. Vols. 1st and 2nd. *Soldan*, Hist. of Protestantism in France until the death of Charles IX., Lps., 1855, 2 vols. *Polenz*, Hist. of French Calvinism until 1789, Gotha, 1857-1864, 4 vols. *E. Smedley*, Hist. of the Ref. in France, New York, 3 vols., 12mo. *Ch. Weiss*, Hist. of the Prot. Ref. in France, Lond., 1854, 2 vols., 12mo, and with an Append. by *H. W. Herbert*, New York, 1854, 2 vols., 12mo. *G. de Felice*, Hist. of the Protestants in France, from the Fr., Lond., 1853, 2 vols., 8vo.

Many circumstances contributed to pave the way for the introduction of the Reformation into France, among the most important of which were the influence exercised by the sects in the southern provinces; the excessive cultivation of polite literature; the active part taken by the University of Paris in the reformatory synods of Constance and Basle, which was in many ways more hurtful than beneficial, and led eventually to the promulgation of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges; the loose administration of the ecclesiastical law, according to the spirit of the so-called Gallican Liberties; the arbitrary methods of *Francis I.* (1515-1547) in conducting ecclesiastical, no less than civil affairs; and, finally, the appointment of bishops, who were more disposed to be servile to the king than obedient to the Pope. Both *Zwinglius* and Calvin had dedicated their most important works to Francis, and Luther and Melanchthon found eager readers in France. Among their most ardent admirers was the famous Biblical scholar, *Lefebvre d'Etaples*, so called from the town of Etaples, near Boulogne-sur-Mer.

The first Protestant community in France was brought together, amid tumult and disorder at *Meaux*, by *William Farel* and *John Leclerc*, a wool-dresser. Notwithstanding that the Sorbonne, whose tendencies were well known to be towards liberalism, had ordered the works of Luther to be burned, they were industriously sought after and eagerly read. The Reformers had powerful patrons at court, and among them *Berquin*, the counsellor of state; the Duchess *d'Etampes*, the king's mistress; and *Margaret of Valois*, the king's sister. Margaret having married Henry d'Albert, King of Navarre, her court became the resort and refuge of Protestants fleeing from persecution. On the other hand, Catholicism found able and zealous advocates and defenders in Cardinal *Duprat*, Chancellor to Francis I.; Cardinal *de Tournon;* and the queen mother, Louise of Savoy.

When the Protestants, emboldened by their growing numbers, and relying on the protection of their patrons, recklessly demolished a figure of our Lord and another of the Blessed Virgin, and had the hardihood to affix to the door of the king's palace an indecent writing against Transubstantiation,[1] *Francis I.* took alarm, and, apprehensive that the evils that had afflicted Germany might come upon his own kingdom, proceeded to take prompt and vigorous measures to check the propagation of Protestantism in France. Many of the Protestants, when pursued, sought safety in flight, and of those who were arrested some were put to death. Among the fugitives was *Calvin*,

[1] Apud *Gerdesius*, Hist. Evangelii renovati, T. VI., p. 50.

who withdrew to Geneva, whence he had his teachings carried into France. But, by a strange inconsistency, while Francis was persecuting Protestants in his own kingdom, he was doing his best to protect and encourage them in Germany[1] and, by following the same policy, his successor, *Henry II.* (1547-1559), got possession of the territories belonging to the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun.[2] This prince published ordinances of unusual severity against the Calvinists, notably the Edict of *Chateaubriand*, in 1551,[2] by which the inquisitorial jurisdiction over heretics, heretofore lodged in ecclesiastical tribunals, was transferred to the *secular* courts, because the former might not pass sentence of death upon those brought to trial before them. It was unfortunate that in France, as elsewhere, a much needed *reform among the clergy* had neither been introduced early enough, nor, when introduced, had it been carried out with sufficient promptitude and thoroughness. The instructions of the Provincial Council of *Narbonne* (December 10-20, 1551) were disregarded by the suffragan bishops, and the reformatory decrees of *Poissy* (1565) met with no efficient response from prelates, who were more intent on enjoying their wealth than on looking after the interests of the Church. The inconsistency of the policy of the Government was favourable to the cause and growth of Protestantism, and accordingly Protestant communities were formed in the cities of *Paris*, *Orleans*, *Rouen*, and *Angers*. At a General Synod, held in *Paris* in 1559, these different communities united themselves into one body; adopted a *Calvinistic Confession of Faith* and a *Presbyterian form of Church government*; and, as if sanctioning in advance a law which would soon operate against themselves, *decreed that all heretics should be put to death*.[3]

During the minority of *Francis II.* (1559-1560), and *Charles IX.* (1560-1574) and the regency of the queen-mother, *Catharine de Medici*, and while the *Dukes of Guise* and the *Princes of Bourbon*, the former supported by the Catholics, and the latter by the Calvinists, were contending for supremacy, the "*Huguenots*,"[4] as the French Protestants were now called, grew daily in numbers and influence.

Destitute of true piety, Catharine was foolishly *superstitious*; and loving *intrigue* rather than a straightforward course, she did not scruple to sacrifice the interests of her children to her own faithless policy. Protestant and Catholic were all one to her, and she

[1] See p. 278. [2] *Barthold*, Germany and the Huguenots, Bremen, 1848, 2 vols.

[3] Cf. *Berthier, S. J.*, Histoire de l'Eglises Gallicane (commencée par *Longueval*; by Berthier, les six derniers volumes), Paris, 1749, 4to, Vol. XVIII., p. 460 sq. *Bordes*, Prêtre de l'oratoire, supplément au traité de *Thomassin* Historique et dogmatique, etc. pour établir et maintenir l'unité de l'église catholique, Paris, 1703, 2 vols., 4to.

[4] For various explanations of the meaning of this word, see *Daniel*, Hist. de France, ed. *Griffet*, 10-54. The derivation which makes "*Huguenots*" equivalent to *Eignots* or *Eidgenossen*, that is, those bound together by an oath, is beyond doubt incorrect. Its probable and more usual derivation is from the French provincial word *Hugo* or *Hugonot*, meaning *ghost of the night*, according to a popular tradition, which states that Hugo-Capet goes about as a spirit, wandering up and down the streets. It was first applied to French Protestants in derision, because they usually held their meetings after night had set in. *Cluet* (Hist. de Verdun et du pays Verdunois) derives it from the word "*Goths*."

coquetted with each as her interests or the exigencies of the moment demanded.[1]

That the Bourbons had espoused the cause of the Calvinists for no reason other than to secure a powerful ally in their struggle against the Dukes of Guise and the House of Valois was very evident. *Louis of Condé*, the youngest of three brothers, became a most zealous advocate of the new teachings; while *Coligny* subsequently proved himself the ablest leader on the Protestant side. Catharine at first took sides with the Dukes of Guise, the most determined enemies of the Huguenots; and, by the marriage of Francis II. to Mary Stuart, threw the weight of her influence against the Bourbons.

The Calvinists, acting upon the advice of their theologians, headed by Beza, formed a conspiracy, known as the Conspiracy of *Amboise* (1560), against Francis II. and the Guises, which, however, was discovered in time to prevent its execution. Its authors were arrested, tried, and put to death.

It had been suggested that the establishment of the Inquisition in France would be an efficient means of preventing the growth of Protestantism; but this was forbidden by the Edict of *Romorantin* (1560); and, at the request of Admiral *Coligny*, the king, at the assembly of *Fontainebleau* (1560), had an enactment passed staying all legal proceedings against the Huguenots on *religious* grounds. He also promised to convoke a national synod for the special purpose of doing away with ecclesiastical abuses. The royal condescension was taken as confession of weakness, and gratitude for royal favours was expressed in the form of a conspiracy, at the head of which was the Prince of *Condé*. Catharine de' Medici pardoned the prince, and, in compliance with the wishes of Admiral Coligny, arranged for a theological conference at *Poissy* (1561), in presence of the court and assembled bishops. The Catholic party was represented by the *Cardinal of Lorraine*, a member of the House of Guise; by the eminent theologian, *Claude d'Espence;* and by the Jesuit *Lainez;* and the Protestant party by *Beza* and *Peter Martyr Vermili*. The controversy was spirited, and at times intemperate, particularly when the question of the Eucharist came up for discussion; but, like all such conferences, settled nothing.[2]

When the Guises entered into an alliance with Anthony, King of Navarre, and the Constable de *Montmorency*, the *astute* Catharine formed a counter-alliance with the Prince of Condé. As a consequence of this step, the Huguenots, by an edict of the year 1562, secured freedom of worship and the right to hold meetings openly anywhere, except in the principal cities of the kingdom,[3] upon con-

[1] Cfr. *Von Reumont*, Catharine de' Medici in Her Youth, Berlin, 1854. *Alberi*, The Life of Catharine de' Medici.

[2] See the Confessio Gallica, presented to Charles IX. in 1561, in *Augusti*, Corpus librorum symbolicor., pp. 110-125.

[3] *Benoît* (Hist. de l'édit de Nantes, Delft, 1639 sq., 5 vols., 4to), Vol. I., Recueil d'édits, p. 1 sq. (Tr.)

dition that they should use no violence towards Catholics. The edict was ill received by the inhabitants of Paris and the Catholic population generally, who were justly incensed by the sanguinary atrocities perpetrated by the Huguenots. The parliament for a long time refused to register it, and did so finally only under protest.

The Calvinists, growing daily more bold and daring, began to murder priests and monks; forcibly compelled wayfarers to come in and listen to the sermons of their preachers, justifying their conduct by a decree of the consistory of *Castres;* and, acting upon enactments of a synod of sixty-two ministers, convoked at *Nîmes* in February, 1562, by *Viret*, interfered with the freedom of Catholic worship by creating disturbances in Catholic churches, and sometimes demolishing the edifices. These outrages roused the indignation of the Catholics, and the pent-up wrath of both parties burst forth, as if by mechanical impulse, leaving as witnesses of its presence all *the extravagant horrors of a civil and religious war.*[1] A trifling event gave the signal for the beginning of the conflict. Some noblemen, belonging to the suite of the Duke of Guise, got into a quarrel with a number of Huguenots, who had assembled for religious service in a barn at *Vassy*, in Champagne, and were disturbing, by their singing of psalms, the Mass, which was being celebrated in a neighbouring church. The duke, hearing the uproar, hastened to the spot to restore order. While endeavouring to do so, he was wounded by the blow of a stone, and his followers, infuriated by the indignity put upon him, rushed upon the Huguenots, killed sixty of their number, and dispersed the rest (March 1, 1562). By Protestant writers this event is called the "Massacre of Vassy." The Calvinists, after many abortive attempts, had succeeded in establishing a community at *Toulouse*, but the peculiar elements of which it was composed gave rise to a suspicion that its object was more military than religious. This suspicion was confirmed when they made an effort to get possession of the city by a *coup de main;* but in this they failed, and the Catholics, after an obstinate, and hard-fought contest, lasting from the 11th to the 17th of May (1562), came off victorious. Refusing to accept the proffered terms of capitulation, the Calvinists attempted to make their escape under cover of the darkness of the night, and falling in with the cavalry of *Savignac*, who had had two brothers killed in the battle of Toulouse, suffered the loss of many of their number. The loss of the Catholics was also severe.[2] The Calvinists complained loudly that the affair of Vassy and that of Toulouse were violations of the Edict of 1562; and the Prince of Condé, acting upon the advice of *Throckmorton*, the English ambassador, put himself at their head, and began hostilities. While marching on Paris, at the head of an army of German

[1] *Lacretelle*, Hist. de France pendant les guerres de religion, Paris, 1814-1816, 4 vols. (transl. into German by *Kiesewetter*, Lps., 1815 sq., 2 vols.) *Herrmann*, The Civil and Religious Wars of France in the sixteenth century, Lps., 1828.

[2] The insurrection of Toulouse (May 11-17, 1562), in "*The Catholic*" of Mentz, 1863, new series, Vol. IX., pp. 227-248, and 317-336.

Lutherans, Condé, together with several of the Protestant leaders, were made prisoners at the battle of *Dreux*, fought December 19, 1562, the issue of which was doubtful. Antoine de Bourbon, King of Navarre, a convert to Catholicity, died of a wound received at the siege of Rouen in the same year. Francis, Duke of Guise, now lieutenant of the kingdom, was assassinated (February 5, 1563) during the siege of Orleans, by *Poltrot de Meré*, a Calvinist in religion, a nobleman by birth, a craven by instinct, and a coward by nature. These events led to the edict of *Amboise* (March 19, 1563), by which freedom of conscience and the privilege of holding public service, under certain restrictions, were granted to the Calvinists. But the reconciliation between the two parties was more apparent than real, and of only short duration. The attempt of Coligny and Condé to get possession of the king's person, by making themselves masters of the castle of *Monceaux*, in Brie, was the occasion of the breaking out of a *second civil war* in the year 1567, during which the bloody atrocities of the Huguenots, known as the "*Michelade of Nîmes*," were perpetrated. At the battle of St. Denys the Catholics gained a splendid victory, though they had to mourn the loss of the gallant Montmorency, Constable of France. In 1568, the Huguenots, through the kind offices of the Elector of the Palatinate, succeeded in negotiating a peace, and having the edict of 1562, without the clauses subsequently added, again enforced. This peace was regarded by the Huguenots only as a pretext to gain time to make preparations for carrying on the war with renewed vigour and energy. And in matter of fact, no sooner had they received from Elizabeth, Queen of England, and from the government of the Netherlands, the money necessary to carry on a campaign, than they at once began *the third civil war* (1568), which, for deeds of blood and acts of retaliation on both sides, surpassed either of the preceding wars.

Briguemont, the most distinguished of the Huguenot leaders, run the ears of assassinated priests upon a cord, and wore them as an ornament about his neck.

After the fall of the Prince of Condé, at the battle of *Jarnac*, in 1569, *Gaspar Coligny* placed himself at the head of the Calvinists, and extorted from the timid court the peace of *Saint-Germain-en-Laye*. This treaty, which was signed August 15, 1570, granted the Reformers freedom of public worship in two cities of each province; removed their political disabilities, thereby permitting them to hold any office of public trust; and, as a security for the future, put them in possession of the four fortified towns of *La Rochelle*, *Montauban*, *Cognac*, and *La Charité*. They had now been successful in obtaining official recognition as a religious organisation.

But treaties could not efface from the minds of Catholics the horrible atrocities committed by the Huguenots, or stifle in their hearts the promptings of revenge. They brooded in silence over the wrongs they had suffered, and in secret they plotted to avenge them. In the hope of maintaining peace, Charles IX. invited Coligny to

his court, and took him into his counsels. Taking advantage of his position, the admiral used his influence to estrange Charles from his mother, and, by persuading him to support the rebels in the Netherlands, involved France in a war with Spain. At length a fortuitous event gave occasion for carrying into effect the long-cherished desire of revenge. The marriage of Henry of Navarre (Henry IV.) to Margaret, the youngest sister of Charles IX., attracted a great number of distinguished Calvinists to Paris, and on the *night of St. Bartholomew* (August 24, 1572), a name of terrible memory, they were set upon and massacred, thus again rekindling the lurid flames of civil war. This horrid massacre, however, was not the outcome of *a long and carefully prepared design.* On the contrary, as Protestant historians admit, it was the result of sudden impulse and hasty action, and was, in its origin, the work of the queen-mother, who was apprehensive of the consequences which might follow an abortive attempt to assassinate Admiral Coligny two days previously, and known to have been inspired by her. The king was prevailed upon by Catharine de' Medici and her youngest son, the Duke of Anjou, and their most intimate friends, to give his consent to the assassination of Admiral Coligny, whom they represented as conspiring to stir up civil war, and they moreover hinted that he had designs upon the king's life. They urged him to immediate action, representing that if he should wait until the next morning, his mother, his brothers, and his most faithful servants would fall victims to the vengeance of the Calvinists. Charles was at first startled by so barbarous a suggestion, and for a long time was undecided how to act, but finally gave his consent.

The Duke of Guise, burning to avenge the death of his father, took upon himself the task of murdering Admiral Coligny. Rumours had been afloat during the day of a Calvinistic conspiracy to murder the Catholics, and the inhabitants of Paris, apprehensive of danger, were awake in momentary expectation of an attack, when the bell of the church of Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois sounded the alarm. This proved to be the signal for the execution of the Huguenots. The work of destruction spread with a rapidity characteristic of the city of Paris. Citizens and soldiers made a rush for the dwellings of the Huguenots, who were shot down, sabred, and pitched into the Seine. The example of the city was imitated in the provinces; but while in the former the murders were sanctioned by royal authority, in the latter they were the effect of popular indignation and a desire of revenge. The number of those who, both in the city and beyond its walls, fell victims to this terrible crime was close upon four thousand. Charles at first endeavoured to shift the responsibility from himself to the Guises, but on the 26th of August, he spoke out plainly in parliament, saying that the deed had been done by his express orders, to head off a conspiracy of the Huguenots against himself, the royal house, the King of Navarre, and the noblest subjects of his kingdom. Such was the account that reached Rome, and the Cardinal of Lorraine, who had gone there to attend a conclave, acting on this information,

asked permission of Pope *Gregory XIII.* to make a solemn act of thanksgiving (*Te Deum*) to God for the preservation of the king's life.[1] On this occasion *Muret* gave a discourse, for which he has been frequently and severely censured, but which, because few who talk or write about it are at the pains to read it, has been grossly misrepresented.[2]

These congratulations are of precisely the same character as the felicitations addressed by European sovereigns to one of their royal cousins upon his escape and preservation from some direful calamity; and being consonant with usage among princes, need excite no surprise, much less the affected horror with which dishonest and sentimental writers are accustomed to speak of them. When the facts became fully and definitely known to the Supreme Pontiff, he left no doubt, either when speaking or writing, of the horror with which the infamous crime inspired him. The magnanimous *John Hennuyer, Bishop of Lisieux*, disregarding the commands of the king, took the Huguenots of his diocese under his special protection, and as a reward for his Christian conduct, had the joy of seeing nearly the whole of them return to the Catholic Church. The court party had hoped that the result of their perfidy and crime would be to weaken the party of the Huguenots, but in this they experienced a bitter disappointment. With an energy that was akin to despair, and a ferocious thirst for revenge, the sectaries rallied for another struggle, and began, in 1573, *the fourth religious war*. Destitute of an army adequate to take the field against the Huguenots, who had now allied themselves with the formidable *political* party lately organized at Milhau, in the Rouergue, Charles was forced to grant them another edict of pacifica-

[1] Abbé *Darras*, Ch. H., Vol. IV., p. 230. (Tr.)

[2] The objectionable paragraph runs as follows: Veriti non sunt adversus illius regis caput ac salutem conjurare, a quo post tot atrocia facinora non modo veniam consecuti erant, sed etiam benigne et amanter excepti. Qua conjuratione sub id ipsum tempus, quod patrando sceleri dicatum ac constitutum erat, divinitus detecta atque patefacta, conversum est in illorum sceleratorum ac fœdifragorum capita id, quod ipsi in regem et in totam prope domum ac stirpem regiam machinabantur. O noctem illam memorabilem—quæ paucorum seditiosorum interitu regem a præsenti cædis periculo, regnum a perpetua civilium bellorum formidine liberavit. Mureti oratio XXII., p. 177, opp. ed. Ruhnkenii. As regards the number of those killed, which varies in different authors from ten to one hundred thousand, it may be remarked that la Popelinière, a writer unquestionably beyond all suspicion of dishonesty, speaks of but one thousand as having been massacred in Paris, and adds that in other cities the number was quite small. Desirous of fixing upon their opponents the stain of so infamous a deed, writers are apt to forget that Protestants had previously slaughtered a far greater number of Catholics. Marshal Montgomery, for instance, had three thousand Catholics butchered at *Orthez*. It is also a well-established fact that from two to three hundred monks were either murdered or pitched into wells; that others were buried alive, and, finally, that as many as fifty cathedrals and five hundred Catholic churches of less importance were demolished. Cf. *Audin*, Hist. de la St. Barthélemy, Paris, 1826, †* *Wm. von Schütz*, St. Bartholomew's Night Cleared up, Lps., 1845. *Soldan*, France and St. Bartholomew's Night. (*Raumer*, Pocket-Book of History, 1854). *Freiburg Cyclopœd*, art. "The Night of St. Bartholomew." Vol. II., p. 48. French trans., art, "Barthélemy (St.) Vol. II. p. 335. *Gandy*, Origin, Character, Progress, and Consequences of the Night of St. Bartholomew (Revue des questions historiques, A. D. 1866).

tion. The king died, May 30, 1574, leaving to his brother, *Henry III.*, the last representative of the House of Valois, who resigned the crown of Poland to accept that of France, a weakened sceptre and a divided kingdom. The condition of affairs required a man of energy and decision of character, and the new king possessed neither; and, in consequence, he was compelled to grant (1576) to the victorious Huguenots a peace incomparably more favourable than any they had yet obtained, which secured to them the free exercise of their religion in every part of the kingdom, except the city of Paris; a complete equality with the Catholics in civil and political rights; and an equal number of representatives in the parliament. Conditions so advantageous gave much offence to Catholics, who, for the purpose of successfully opposing the Calvinists, now formed themselves into a *League*, at the head of which Henry III., when the States assembled at *Blois* (1577), thought it prudent to place himself. Violations of the last treaty of pacification by the Huguenots gave occasion to a fresh war, the result of which was the edict of *Poitiers* (1577), which materially restricted the concessions granted in the last treaty.

As Henry III. was childless, and as his brother, the Duke of Alençon, had lately died, the two aspirants to the throne were the King of Navarre and the young Prince of Condé, both of whom were Calvinistic leaders. Dreading the consequences of having a Calvinist become King of France, the Catholics were anxious to bestow the crown on the *Cardinal de Bourbon*, the *Catholic* nearest of kin to the king. The proposal met with the approval of the cardinal, who, in 1585, published the manifesto of Péronne, with a view of furthering his interests. By misrepresentation and a dishonest concealment of facts, Pope *Gregory XIII.* was induced to give his consent to this arrangement. To hasten its consummation, a League was formed, extending to every part of the kingdom. When the Pope had been accurately informed of the dishonest purposes of the Leaguers, he withdrew his former approval; and his successor, *Sixtus V.*, while condemning them as dangerous conspirators, declared that, according to the fundamental laws of the realm, both Henry of Navarre and the Prince of Condé were incapable of ruling over France. Henry of Navarre appealed from the decision of the Pope to that of parliament, which had already declined to publish the pontifical bull. The affair was submitted to the arbitration of arms. Henry of Navarre was victorious at the battle of *Coutras* in 1587. After the assassination of the Duke of Guise, and the execution of the cardinal, his brother, both of which deeds had been done by order of Henry III., the League again became formidable. So violent were the denunciations of the Sorbonne of Paris against the king that he was forced into an alliance with Henry of Navarre. He was shortly after assassinated (August 2, 1589) by *James Clement;* and, despite the papal bull, *Henry IV.* of Navarre succeeded to the throne.

Pope Clement VIII. consented to recognize his title on condition

that he would embrace the Catholic faith.[1] Persuaded that he could successfully rule the country only as a Catholic, and acting upon the advice of *Sully*, his minister and personal friend, and at the same time consulting his own interest, he concluded that "France was worth the offering of a Mass,"[2] and accordingly professed himself a Catholic, July 25, 1593. Two years later, the Pope proposed to remove from him the sentence of excommunication that had been passed upon him, provided he in turn would promise to become the protector of the Catholic Church, and to publish, with some omissions, the decrees of the Council of Trent. The nation had now begun to regard the League with disfavour, and its dissolution was completed by the attitude of the Roman Pontiff.

The spirit of the Calvinists, however, was still unbroken. They were as seditious as ever, and had lost none of their uncompromising independence. Notwithstanding Henry's firmness of character, they succeeded in extorting from him, in 1598, the *Edict of Nantes*, by which they obtained the free exercise of their religion *in every part of the kingdom;* were made eligible to the Parliament of Paris; authorized to form separate chambers in the Parliaments of Grenoble and Bordeaux; permitted to hold synods; and empowered to found universities at *Saumur*, *Montauban*, *Montpellier*, and *Sedan*. These concessions were at once so ample and so unusual that it required all the tact and resolution of the king to have the edict registered. Moreover, the hostility of the Catholics was quickened and intensified by the persistent intolerance of the Calvinists, who, in the thirty-first article of the Confession of the Synod of *Gap* (1603), made the following declaration: "We believe that the Pope is truly Antichrist and the son of perdition, spoken of in Holy Writ as the whore clad in scarlet raiment."

The assassination of Henry IV., on the 14th of May, 1610, by *Francis Ravaillac*, may be traced to the rancorous and implacable enmities existing between the two parties.

Mary de' Medici was declared regent during the non-age of Louis XIII. (1610-1643), and, while she held the reins of government, the Huguenots enjoyed a season of comparative quiet. Under Cardinal *Richelieu* (1624-1642), however, whose rare intellectual endowments were supplemented by unusual energy of action, their condition underwent a complete change. Believing that no lasting peace could be hoped for from a body of men who were constantly showing signs of discontent, and assuming attitudes of defiance, and who were highly exasperated because the young king had married a Spanish princess, and the churches of Béarn, which had been taken from the

[1] There is still extant in the archives of Prince Doria an unpublished autograph correspondence between *Henry IV.* and *Clement VIII.*, which is necessarily of the highest importance to a thorough understanding of the religious condition of Europe immediately after the return of the King of France to the Catholic Church. Cf. also *Staehelin*, The Conversion of King Henry IV. to the Catholic Church, Basle, 1856.

[2] *Journal des Debats*, September, 1871.

Catholics, had been again restored to them, the cardinal made a radical change in the legislation regarding the Calvinists. *La Rochelle* was their last stronghold, and its capture was at once the death-blow to their party as a political organization (1628), and put a period to a bloody *strife*, which had lasted for *seventy-one years*.[1] Hence they made no attempt to disturb the peace during the minority of Louis XIV.; and when, in 1659, acting upon the suggestion of the Synod of *Montpazier*,[2] they offered to ally themselves with England, the plot was discovered, and its authors severely punished.

The sees of France were at this time filled *by men of ability and learning*, through whose exertions, admirably seconded by a body of priests, *trained in the schools of St. Francis de Sales and St. Vincent de Paul*, and distinguished by the purity of their lives and the warmth of their zeal, great numbers of the Calvinists were by degrees brought back to the Church.[3] Thousands were also converted by the publication, in 1668, with the papal approbation, of *Bossuet's* "*Exposition de la Doctrine Catholique.*" The freedom of those who chose to continue heretics was being constantly abridged, until finally Louis XIV., having reached the superlative of absolutism, which he tersely expressed by the well-known phrase, "*I am the State*" (*L'état c'est moi*), and believing that the opposition and obstinacy of the Huguenots proceeded from political, rather than religious motives, acted upon the advice of *le Tellier*, his chancellor, and revoked the *Edict of Nantes*, October 18, 1685, substituting in its place another of twelve articles,[4] by which nearly all their privileges were withdrawn, and they themselves subjected to many hardships. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes, while it cannot be said to have been wholly arbitrary, was a very inopportune and unwise measure. It is true it received the cordial approbation of many bishops of France, but it is equally true that it drove the Calvinists to desperation. They had also other causes of complaint. *Louvois*, the minister of state, by sending among them *missionaries*, *attended by dragoons* (*Dragonnades*, *la mission bottée*,

[1] *Fénelon*, Correspondance diplomatique, the last volume of which was published under the editorial supervision of *Cooper*, Paris, 1841. It contains valuable information on the battles of *Jarnac* and *Moncontour* (Dep. Vienne), the *Massacre of St. Bartholomew*, and the siege of La Rochelle.

[2] Not Montpellier, as is said in the French translation. Montpazier is the chief town of a canton in the department de la Dordogne, so named from a northern tributary of the river Garonne, with which united it forms la Gironde. (Tr.)

[3] *Picot*, Essai historique sur l'influence de la religion en France pendant le XVIIe siècle, Paris, 1824, 2 vols.; Louvain, 1824. German transl., by *Raes* and *Weis*.

[4] On the legality of this measure, *Hugo Grotius* (Apol. Riveti discuss., p. 22) says. "Norint illi, qui Reformatorum sibi imponunt vocabulum, non esse illa *fœdera*, sed regum edicta ob publicam facta utilitatem, et revocabilia, si aliud regibus publica utilitas suaserit." Conf. (*Benoist*) Hist. de l'édit. de Nantes, Delft, 1693-1695, 5 vols., 4to. (*Ancillon*) L'irrévocabilité de l'édit. de Nantes, prouvée par les principes de la politique, Amsterdam, 1688. It is unnecessary to call attention to the numerous instances in which Protestants persecuted *Catholics* with incomparably greater severity; but it is a little remarkable that authors, who profess to write fairly and dispassionately, while employing all their eloquence to excite sympathy for the former, cannot check their prejudices sufficiently to treat the latter with ordinary courtesy.

or, les conversions par logemens), to work their conversion, had highly exasperated them. In consequence, sixty-seven thousand of them went immediately into *voluntary exile*, taking up their abodes in England, Holland, and Denmark, but chiefly in Brandenburg. It is worthy of mention that Pope *Innocent XI.* disapproved of these severe measures, but not being himself on amicable terms with the French king, requested James II. of England to interpose his good offices in behalf of the oppressed Protestants.[1]

§ 333. *Protestantism in the Netherlands.*

Stradæ Romani, S. J., Hist. Belgicæ duæ decades Romæ, 1640-1647, 2 vols., fol. and frequently. *H. Leo*, Twelve Books of Netherlandish History, Halle, 1835, Pt. II. The *same*, Manual of Univ. Hist., Vol. III. *Prescott*, Hist. of the Reign of Philip II., King of Spain, London, 1857. †**Koch*, The Revolt and Defection of the Netherlands from Spain, Lps., 1860. †* *Holzwarth*, The Defection of the Netherlands, Schaffhausen, 1865-1871 (Vol. I. from 1539-1566; Vol. II., in two parts, fr. 1566-1572, and fr. 1572-1581 resp., 1584). *Nuyens*, Hist. of the Netherlandish Rebellion, 1865-1870, in 4 vols. Conf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., pp. 193 sq., 269 sq. *J. L. Motley*, The Rise of the Dutch Republic, 1856, tr. into Germ. (Dresden, 1857), Dutch and French. By the *same*, Hist. of the United Netherlands, of which two vols. appeared in 1860.

There was no country of Europe more exposed than the Netherlands to the twofold infection of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresies. To this condition of things many causes contributed. The inhabitants were the unwilling subjects of Charles V.; they kept up an active commercial intercourse with Germany; and their minds had been long distracted, and were now unsettled by the quarrels of literary men and the controversies of the Schoolmen. These circumstances were fully appreciated by Charles V., and, fearing their consequences, he ordered the Edict of Worms against Luther to be published in the Netherlands; had the Inquisition introduced; and, by the execution of *Henry Voes* and *John Esch* (1523), gave the people to understand that he was terribly in earnest in what he was doing. Here the emperor put aside the gentle forbearance which he exercised towards the Protestants of Germany, and, by a display of unusual severity, sought to avert from his own patrimonial dominions the disasters, such as the Peasants' War, which the Reformation had brought upon that country. But, in spite of this rigour, Holland soon became the scene of the fanatical excesses and barbarous cruelties of the *Anabaptists*. A Dutch *translation of the Bible*, made in the spirit of the principles of Luther, by *James van Liesveld*, was published in 1525. Charles saw that still more rigorous measures were necessary, and he accordingly issued decrees of greater severity against the heretics in 1530 and 1550.

When *Philip II.* (from 1556) succeeded to his father, his zeal to preserve the purity of the Catholic faith led him to employ measures still more severe and despotic against these unfortunate people, thereby violating rights that had been secured to them by the most solemn

[1] Such is the testimony of *Macaulay*. See *Döllinger*, The Church and the Churches &c., Preface, p. XXXIII.

pledges. The Flemings, who were already discontented at seeing the more important offices of State filled by the Spaniards, were still further incensed when Philip II., by the authority of a bull obtained from Pope Paul IV., bearing the date of May 14, 1559, in place of the four old sees of *Utrecht*, *Arras*, *Cambrai*, and *Tournay*, established fourteen new ones, and raised *Malines*, *Cambrai*, and *Utrecht* to the dignity of Archbishoprics. These States had been entrusted by Philip to the government of Charles V.'s natural daughter, *Margaret, Duchess of Parma*, with Cardinal *Granvelle* as prime minister. The cardinal, who was a man of indefatigable industry, and possessed great capacity for business, sided with the Flemings in their opposition to the increase in the number of episcopal sees ;[1] but his devotion to the Head of the Church, and his loyalty to the king, rendered him an object of aversion to the malcontents, and furnished them a pretext for revolt. Their hatred of him culminated when the Council of Regency was called to consider the question of publishing the Decrees of the Council of Trent in the Netherlands. The cardinal favoured, the Calvinists steadily opposed the publication. They organized against him. At their head were *William, Prince of Orange*, Stadtholder of Holland, Zealand, and Utrecht ; *Count d' Egmont*, Stadtholder of Flanders and Artois ; and *Count de Hoorne*, High Admiral of the United Provinces. They formed a league, and so threatening was their attitude that Margaret was forced to beg that the obnoxious minister be recalled (1564). The powerful Triumvirs now resumed their places in the Council of State, whence they had withdrawn, but they did not possess sufficient influence in that body to prevent a vote favouring the publication of the Tridentine Decrees. When the result of the vote reached Philip, he ordered all the edicts against heretics to be enforced with the extremest rigour. The order furnished a fresh and plausible pretext for opposition on the part of the malcontents, who were under the skilful direction of William "*The Silent*," Prince of Orange. He was a son-in-law of Coligny's, and, from motives of ambition, devotedly attached to the cause of the Huguenots.

On the 16th of February, 1565, a dozen noblemen, wholly under his influence, signed a compact, known as "*The Compromise of Breda*," by which they demanded a redress of grievances. In a few months the number of signers had increased to two thousand,[2] of whom two hundred were Catholics. Their arms and their services they placed at the command of William. This "*Compromise*" the Triumvirs designedly abstained from signing. Meetings were held throughout the whole of the Netherlands, and in the following month of April, a deputation of two hundred and fifty gentlemen sent through Margaret a petition to Philip, demanding the suppression of the Inquisition and a revocation or suspension of the severe edict of religion with which they were threatened.

[1] Documents inédits, papiers d'état du Cardinal de Granvelle, Paris, 1841-1842, 3 vols. 4to.

[2] *Freiburg Cyclop.*, Vol. VII., p. 602. (Tr.)

Balaimont, one of the nobles of Margaret's court, contemptuously styled the members of the deputation "*Gueux*," or Beggars, a name which they afterwards appropriated as one of honourable distinction. Notwithstanding that the petitioners professed their intention of maintaining the Catholic Church, and that alone, a Protestant *Symbol* appeared in the Netherlands in the year 1561 (*Confessio Belgica*), and was adopted by many of the Belgians, who worshipped apart by themselves and followed a rite of their own.[1] Receiving encouragement from the magistrates and nobles, the Protestants rose simultaneously over the whole country, and Calvinists, who had sought an asylum in France, returned in large bodies. Conscious of their power, they began to inflict upon others the treatment of which they had but lately so bitterly complained. Even in the larger cities, they entered, sacked, and pulled down churches and convents, destroyed images and pictures, and so blind was their rage that the magnificent cathedral of Antwerp did not escape its fury. In the meantime, the regent, after the recall of the obnoxious *Cardinal Granvelle*, succeeded in concluding a treaty with Louis of Orange and twelve noblemen, which was in a measure satisfactory to the Reformers. By this instrument their grievances were corrected, and the severity of the ordinances in force against them mitigated. These concessions, however, did not prevent them from rising in rebellion, and submitting their cause to the fortune of a doubtful war, in which they were completely vanquished.

William of Orange was forced to quit the country, and seek an asylum in Germany; and Count d'Egmont, deserting the Protestant cause, threw himself upon the mercy of the king (1567). The royal authority was restored in the revolted provinces, and the Catholic religion was again triumphant.

Philip should have been content with matters as they now stood · but, instead of being so, he adopted an unwise and aggressive policy. Withdrawing the government from the gentle and prudent Margaret, he transferred it to the stern, but by no means tyrannical, *Duke of Alva*,[2] whom he appointed generalissimo, and sent into the Nether-

[1] *Augusti*, Corpus libror. symbolicor., pp. 170-177.

[2] The American, *Wm. H. Prescott*, in his History of the Reign of Philip the Second, King of Spain, Boston, ed. of 1855, Vol. II., p. 298, says of him: "Far from being moved by personal considerations, no power could turn him from that narrow path which he professed to regard as the path of duty." And, as a proof that Alva was not wholly insensible to feelings of compassion, when they did not interfere with the performance of his duty, Prescott refers to a letter of his to the king, written in behalf of the afflicted family of Count d'Egmont. The duke says: "Your majesty will understand the regret I feel at seeing these poor lords (Egmont and Hoorne) brought to such an end, and myself obliged to bring them to it. But I have not shrunk from doing what is for your majesty's service. . . . The Countess Egmont's condition fills me with the greatest pity, burdened as she is with a family of eleven children, none old enough to take care of themselves; and she too a lady of so distinguished a rank, sister of the Count Palatine, and of so virtuous, truly Catholic, and exemplary life. There is no man in the country who does not grieve for her! I cannot but commend her," he concludes, "as I do now, very humbly, to the good grace of your majesty, beseeching you to call to mind that if the count, her husband, come to trouble at the close of his days, *he formerly rendered great service to the State*."

lands at the head of ten thousand picked men. Alva made his entry into Brussels on the 22nd of August, 1567, and began the work of his office by appointing a "*Council of Troubles*," consisting of twelve persons, whose duty it was to hunt up the authors of the late troubles and bring them to summary punishment. Many of the nobility, who had taken part in the revolt, fled from the country. Of those who remained, eighteen were executed on the 1st of June, 1568; and, on the 5th of the same month, Count d'Egmont and Count de Hoorne died the death of conspirators at Brussels. The property of the leaders of the conspiracy was confiscated. William of Orange, whose estates had thus escheated to the Crown, now began to levy war with troops raised in Germany and France, and, aided by his brother, Louis of Nassau, meditated a simultaneous attack upon the Spaniards in Friesland, Guelderland, and Brabant. This design was frustrated by Alva. Louis, having been defeated at Gemmingen, near the Ems (July 21, 1568), hastened to join his brother with the remnants of his forces, and the two now endeavoured to effect a junction with Condé who was at the head of the French Calvinists. Alva, who divined their plans, intercepted them, and forced them, after many defeats, to retreat into Germany. Thus far Alva had discharged the important duties of his office with ability and success. But the *new scheme for raising money*, by exacting, besides other imposts, one-tenth of the value of goods every time they changed hands, which he now introduced, again fanned into a flame the embers of a protracted and momentous civil war.

The Dutch merchants turned towards William of Orange for protection, and contributed liberally to enable him to continue a struggle which they hoped would deliver them from the tyranny of the Spanish yoke. The injudicious measure of Alva, so detrimental to the commercial interests of the Netherlands, gave a decided and triumphant victory to the Reformers, which, under other circumstances, they could never have obtained in that country.

William at once changed his whole plan of operations. Transferring the war from land to water, he issued letters of marque to privateers, which swept the sea in search of Spanish vessels. The northern provinces rose in insurrection, and so critical did Alva's position become, that he sent in his resignation to his government, and was recalled in the autumn of 1573. He was replaced by *Don Luis de Requesens y Zuñiga*, a man of ability and moderation. He revoked the odious financial edicts, and was just beginning to give fair promise of a prosperous and successful career, when, unfortunately for the interests of Spain in the Netherlands, he died prematurely, in 1576. His successor in the government was the illustrious hero of Lepanto, *Don John of Austria*, Philip's half-brother. Lacking the skill of a statesman, and the sternness of a disciplinarian, he proved wholly unfit for his new position. The northern and southern provinces rose in revolt, and, by their combined efforts, expelled the Spanish soldiers who plundered their country and the commander who tolerated their excesses (1576). This enabled the Prince of Orange to include five

more provinces in the confederacy that had been formed, "as a defence against any violence that might be practised in the name, or to promote the interests, of the king." Don John of Austria was declared an enemy of the State, and his successor, *Archduke Matthias of Austria*, being no match in diplomacy for the astute William, was wholly deceived as to the import of the oath which that wily statesman prevailed upon him to take (1578), and was in consequence obliged to be content with a merely nominal authority. War again broke out. *Don Alessandro da Farnese*, now in command of the Royal forces, gained a splendid victory at Gemblours (January 31, 1578), thus preserving the southern provinces to the king and the Catholic cause. The northern provinces were in the hands of William of Orange, who, though he had given pledges to respect the rights of Catholics, failed to make them good in a single instance.

The *Treaty of Union* between the *seven northern provinces* was signed at *Utrecht* in 1579, by which it was agreed that the Confederated Provinces should form an indissoluble union, and that questions of war and peace and the levying of taxes should be submitted to a vote of the representatives of the Confederacy. William of Orange was appointed stadtholder, high admiral, and generalissimo of all the forces, whether on land or sea, and was to hold these offices for life. Heretofore the provinces in revolt had headed all their public documents with the name of the king; but they now left off doing so, and substituted instead that of William of Orange.[1] In 1568 William had declared that "he had taken up arms to secure religious freedom to the Catholics, no less than to the Evangelicals," and that it was his intention "to see that the former should be in the full enjoyment of their rights." He, however, forgot or proved false to his promise, and in 1582 published an ordinance, which was rigorously enforced, proscribing the Catholic religion in Holland. William was assassinated in the year 1584, but his loss did not shake the courage of his followers. They called to the head of the Government his second son, *Maurice*, who, with the aid of troops sent over by Queen Elizabeth, maintained himself during the interval from 1588 to 1590, and took the offensive in 1591, after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, and the year following, when the royal troops were under the command of the successor to Don Alessandro, who had lately died. By the armistice of 1609, the northern provinces were recognized as a *Republic*, but their independence was not definitively acknowledged by Spain until the peace of Westphalia, in 1648.

The close alliance of these confederated provinces with France and England was favourable to the spread of Calvinism, whose principles were indorsed by the synods of *Dordrecht* in 1574 and 1618, and defended and developed by the University of *Leyden*. The Catholics in Holland, however, were still very numerous, and the southern provinces of Belgium remained steadily loyal to the Church.

[1] *Freiburg Cyclop.*, art. "Netherlands." (Tr.)

Observation.—"In *Italy* and *Spain*," says *Guericke*, "the darkness of Popery shut out the pure light of the Gospel." *McCrie*, an English writer, speaks of the *generous* sympathy with which Protestantism was received in these countries; but it may be truthfully said of his statements, that they belong to the domain of fiction rather than that of fact.[1] There is no proof to the contrary furnished by the Italian work entitled "*On the Charity of Christ*," published in 1542.[2] *Padre Saluzzo, O. S. F.*, was mainly instrumental in preventing the spread of Protestantism in Upper Italy.

§ 334. *General Causes of the Rapid Spread of Protestantism.*

†**Marx*, Causes of the Rapid Propagation of the Reformation, etc., Mentz, 1834. *Moehler's* Ch. Hist., Vol. III., pp. 159 sq.

It is perhaps no more than natural that Protestant writers should manifest a certain bias when treating of this subject; but it is certainly a little strange to find authors of name comparing the rapid spread of Protestantism to the progress made by Christianity when it was first preached to man, without taking into account the very different circumstances which accompanied the propagation of both the one and the other.

It should be borne in mind, on the one hand, that the early Christian confessors were reviled and persecuted as no set of men ever were; and, on the other, that favours the most flattering and privileges the most ample were the portion of the Reformers.

To escape the charge of partiality, we shall confine ourselves to facts from which a judgment may be fairly formed.

1. Luther's efforts received a colour of recognition and support from the serious complaints which had been made in general councils, with a view to the correction of existing abuses. Many well-meaning bishops had spoken out in no faltering terms against abuses of every kind, and chiefly against those of indulgences; and hence, when Luther re-echoed their language, he was listened to with approval. Moreover, at the outset of his career, he professed to teach only the pure doctrine of the Catholic Church, and to desire only the correction of abuses and the enforcement of discipline; and his professions being honourable and apparently sincere, carried with them a weight of authority to which they were by no means entitled. In this way, for the time being, he imposed upon a great number of persons, not among the illiterate alone, but among the learned also; and such men as Cochlæus, Willibald Pirkheimer, Zasius, Wizel, John Haner, Erasmus, and others of equal distinction in the literary world were among his dupes.

2. Luther and his followers employed every means, fair and un-

[1] *Thos. McCrie*, Hist. of the Rise and Fall of the Reformation in Italy (Germ. by *Friedrich*, Lps., 1829). By the *same*, Hist. of the Development and Suppression of the Reformation in Spain (Germ. by *Plieninger*, Stuttg., 1835). *Adolfo de Castro*, Hist. of the Spanish Protestants and their Persecution by Philip II. (tr. fr. the Spanish into German, and edited by *Hertz*, Frankfort, 1866). *Franzisca Hernandez* and Fray Franzisco Ortiz, or Beginnings of Reformatory Movements in Spain during the reign of Emperor Charles V., by *E. Bœhmer*, Lps., 1865.

[2] Germ. transl., Lps., 1855. Cf. *A. Theiner*, Della introduzione del Protestantismo in Italia tentata, Roma e Napoli, 1850.

fair, to misrepresent the teaching of the Catholic Church, and to put forward their own as the pure and genuine teaching of the Gospel. They did not hesitate, when addressing the illiterate, to tell them that the Mass was an impious act of worship and the veneration of saints an *idolatrous one*. The Calvinistic Confession of Faith proclaimed "that pure and divine truth is banished from the Church of Rome; that her Sacraments are corrupted and falsified; *and that she tolerates in her bosom every sort of impiety and superstition.*"[1] And having adopted these unscrupulous methods, Luther went on to speak and write with such an air of assurance that it was next to impossible that any doubt as to the truth of his assertions should enter into the minds of those who had once received what he said with implicit trust.[2] Papal tyranny was an inspiring theme for eloquent and lively sermons, offensive satires, and abusive libels; and the beauties of evangelical liberty were spoken of in words so fulsome and glowing that people began to fancy that these incontinent preachers were really messengers of glad tidings to man.

3. That the spirited and popular writings of Luther, Zwingli, and others of the Reformers, while based upon erroneous principles, contained *many truths*,[3] many passages full of beauty, and many arguments that commended themselves to the reason, cannot be denied; neither can it be denied that the writings of Melanchthon, Calvin, and Beza possessed a grace, a limpidity, and a classic purity of style, which of themselves, and independently of the subject-matter, gave a pleasing and fascinating charm to the compositions of these authors. Another secret of the influence of Luther and his followers was their zeal in instructing the people and their solicitude in training children; and the favour with which the catechisms published by Luther were received prompted Catholics to give more attention to the serious and sacred duty which they were intended to accomplish. Again, the people were delighted at hearing the Divine Service recited in their own tongue, and gratified at being permitted to partake of the Chalice, for which they had desired so long and so ardently. These concessions produced an impression so deep and enduring that, while it was obscured as time went on, it was never wholly effaced.

4. By placing in the hands of the people a new edition of the Bible, and making everyone his own interpreter of its contents, Luther flattered the vanity of the masses and secured their allegiance and good-will. He was never tired telling them that to interpret Scripture was their privilege equally with the clergy. "Every Christian," said he, "has unquestionably a right to teach;[4] and if the clergy have heretofore arrogated to themselves the sole right of reading the Scriptures, it is only because they foresaw that if it were the privilege of all, the office of the priesthood would cease to exist, and the

[1] The French Calvinistic Confession of Faith repeats the same untruth.
[2] *C. A. Menzel*, L. c., Vol. I., p. 84.
[3] See above, p. 225.
[4] 1 Peter, ii. 9.

people become in all things their equals." In the doctrine of Luther concerning *slave-will* and *justification by faith alone*, the people found a convenient remedy for sin, and an easy means of restoring peace to their troubled consciences. The confessing of one's sins and the obligation of fasting are duties irksome to human nature, and they were glad to be rid of them. Finally, the charm of novelty, which has at all times and under every condition so many fascinations for the popular mind, was not without its influence in propagating the teachings of the Reformers. That religious motives had little to do with the conversion of the bulk of those who passed over to Lutheranism is abundantly shown by the profligacy of their lives, which were so shameless that even Luther himself confessed that nothing comparable to such a state of morality ever existed under the Papacy. "The devil," said he, "having been driven out of them, has returned again with seven others, and their last condition is worse than the first."[1]

5. Luther also displayed considerable skill in turning the quarrel between the Humanists and Schoolmen to his own advantage; and as at the outset of his career he had profited by the outspoken protests of many well-meaning bishops against the abuses of indulgences, so at a later period he managed to draw to his side a number of Humanists deceived by his specious professions. The *printing-press*, too, which had just commenced the work it has kept up ever since with *such ceaseless activity*, was employed by him to spread far and wide, with a rapidity never before known to the world, the knowledge of his undertaking, and more or less detailed accounts of his labours.

6. *By declaring celibacy and monastic vows abolished*, Luther gained over many ecclesiastics, to whom these restraints and obligations had become irksome. Having once broken their solemn promises to God, these unworthy churchmen were prevented by love of sensual indulgence and fear of punishment from ever again returning to the Church.

7. *Self-interest*, on the part of those who embraced Protestantism, goes a long way in accounting for its success. "The bold attacks made upon time-honoured authority, and the appeals to individual reason and private judgment in matters of religion, were soon found to be equally applicable to affairs in the temporal order. If the commands of the Pope were spurned, why should the advice of the parish priest be listened to? If the Reformers treated crowned heads with contempt, how could the people be expected to continue long obedient subjects? If the peasant might form his own judgment of the things of God, might he not with equal justice define his rights as to the chase and pasturage? If the monk was no longer bound by vows, which he had *voluntarily* spoken, why should the peasant be a slave to obligations to which he had never given his consent, and which he believed to be contrary to the will of Christ?"[2]

[1] See above, p. 270 sq.

[2] *Raumer*, Hist. of Europe from the End of the Fifteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 380.

The people, however, were not put to the trouble of drawing those inferences; Luther did it for them in his two works, "*On the Liberty of the Children of God*," and "*On the Temporal Power;*" and that they were quick at getting at his meaning and energetic in turning his teaching to practical account, the history of the "*Peasants' War*" abundantly proves. "These people," said Melanchthon, in a tone of complaint, "growing daily more accustomed to liberty, now that they have shaken off the yoke of the bishops, will accept no other. What do they care for doctrine or religion? Their thoughts are fixed only on liberty and power."

8. "By a singular coincidence," says *Schiller*,[1] "*two political facts* contributed to bring about the schism. On the one hand, the sudden preponderance of the House of Austria, which menaced the liberties of Europe, and caused princes to fly to arms; and, on the other, the ardent zeal of this house for the maintenance of the old faith, drove nations into revolt." Princes were all the more willing to take advantage of the opportunity thus offered them, in that they hoped to derive from it many advantages. First of all, they desired to free themselves from the suzerainty of the emperor; next, Luther had commanded them *to seize and confiscate the estates of churches and convents;* and, lastly, they were allowed by his system to take the supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction into their own hands. Against the cupidity which he thus excited in their breasts, he was himself obliged, some time later, to protest. "There are still," he says in one of his sermons, "some truly good evangelical princes;" and he adds the reason, "because there are yet remonstrances in Catholic churches which they can steal, and monastic estates which they can confiscate." In his "Table Talk" he consigns to the custody of his satanic majesty those princes who appropriated to their own use the goods they had stolen from the Church, while ministers of the Gospel, with wives and children on their hands, had not enough to keep them from starving. Unless aid be sent, and that speedily, he said, it will be all up with the Gospel and the schools in this country, for the pastors are destitute.

9. When princes had gained so many advantages by the Reformation, it was but natural that *they should employ all the resources at their command to have it introduced everywhere.* On this point the proofs are so evident that *Jurieu*, an inveterate enemy of the Catholic Church, makes the following candid avowal: "That the Reformation was brought about by political power," he says, "is incontestable. Thus in Geneva, it was the Senate; in other parts of Switzerland, the Grand Council of each Canton; in Holland, the States-General; in Denmark, Sweden, England, and Scotland, kings and parliaments that introduced it. Nor was the supreme power of the State content with guaranteeing full liberty to the partisans of the Reformation; it also took from Papists their churches, and for-

[1] Hist of the Thirty Years' War, Bk. I., in initio.

bade them *to exercise their religion in public.* Nay, more, in some countries the private exercise of Catholic worship was forbidden by legislative enactments." "In Silesia," says *Adolphus Menzel*,[1] "the new church was mainly established by the favour and protection of princes and magistrates. Nearly all the people were loyal to the ancient faith, and had not the most remote thought of making any change in their religion. The Polish peasants, like those of German descent, embraced the religion that had been introduced by the nobles. In Sweden, Gustavus Vasa, who had conquered the independence of his country, professed the new teachings, because he desired to bring to the support of his throne the wealth and the power that had been taken from the clergy. In England, the divorce of *Henry VIII.*, and the quarrel to which it gave rise between himself and the Pope, was the occasion of the Reformation." The testimony of these writers is corroborated by that of Frederic the Great in his Memoirs. "If the causes," said he, "which promoted the spread of the Reformation be reduced to their last analysis, they will be found to be as follows: *In Germany it was interest; in England lust; and in France a love of novelty.*"[2]

It may be here remarked that of all those princes who were so enthusiastic for the Reformation, there was not a single one distinguished for honesty of conduct or purity of morals. We have only to compare the impure and bloodthirsty Henry VIII.; the sensual *Philip of Hesse;* the unbelieving and frivolous *Albert* of Prussia; the despotic *Christiern II.* of Denmark; and the equally despotic *Gustavus Vasa* of Sweden, with contemporary Catholic princes like *George*, Duke of Saxony; *Joachim*, Elector of Brandenburg; the Emperors *Maximilian, Charles V., Ferdinand I.*, and *Ferdinand II.;* the Dukes of Bavaria, *Albert* and *Maximilian I.*, and many others, and we shall see how incomparably more noble, more pure, and more elevated were the lives of the latter than those of the former.

[1] L. c., Vol. II., p. 2; Vol. III., p. 91 sq. If it be said that Catholic governments also persecuted and put to death some of those who first professed and propagated the new teachings, it may be fairly replied that there is a wide distinction between the two cases. Catholic rulers desired to protect the *ancient religion, which had been maintained for a thousand years, and was so essentially a part of the laws and constitutions of their States* that they regarded an assault upon it as a menace to the social and political orders to which it had given life and form. (See above, p. 281, the warning of Charles V.) Experience had taught them that political commotions, revolts, and civil wars are the inevitable consequences of religious schism, and these they were anxious to provide against. A glance at the sad condition of those countries over which the disasters of religious wars had passed made rulers, whose realms had as yet escaped such visitations, more energetic in adopting measures of unusual severity, or crushing out the rising sect the moment it gave tokens of its presence. And, as a matter of fact, this policy saved Spain from the horrors of a religious war. Cf. *Hortig's* Ch. Hist., continued by *Döllinger*, Vol. II., Pt. II., p. 690.

[2] "Si l'on veut réduire les causes du progrès de la réforme à des principes simples, on verra, qu'en Allemagne ce fut l'ouvrage de l'intérêt, en Angleterre celui de l'amour, et en France celui de la nouveauté." (Memoires de Brandenbourg.)

CHAPTER III.

CONTINUATION OF THE HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM—ITS INTERNAL DISSENSIONS.

†*Döllinger*, The Reformation and its Interior Development, Ratisb., 1836 sq., 3 vols. *Perrone*, Il Protestantesimo e la Regola di Fede, 3 pts. in 3 vols., Rome, 1853; Fr. tr., Paris, 1854. *Balmes*, El Protestantismo comparado con el Catolicismo, 4 vols., Barcelona, 1842-1844; Engl. tr., Baltim., 1851. †*Nicolas*, The Relation of Protestantism and all Heresies to Socialism, Mentz and Paderborn, 1853. (Onno Klopp), Studies on Catholicism, Protestantism, and Toleration in Germany, Schaffhausen, 1857. *Gieseler*, Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., pp. 115-382, gives copious quotations from authentic sources, and adds the bibliography incident to the subject. *Frank*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, Lps., 1862, Pt. I. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, Munich, 1867.

§ 335. *General Characteristics of Protestantism.*

The Lutherans, like the Catheri and Waldenses of the Middle Age, and kindred sects of an earlier date, professed to restore the true Apostolic Church by abolishing the abuses of the Church Catholic, and setting up *Holy Scripture as the one and only ground of Faith.* This absolute appeal to the authority of the Bible continued to be the underlying principle of the new system, even after discussions upon doctrines the most vital had demonstrated its utter insufficiency, and contradictions the most glaring[1] had proved the necessity of tradition, which the Reformers had so arrogantly rejected.[2] For them a visible, infallible, and sanctifying Church, established by God and *anterior to the Holy Scriptures*, had no longer any meaning. They rejected her authority and denied even her existence as a visible organization. In her place they substituted an *invisible Church*, whose members, scattered over the face of the earth, were united in fellowship by hidden and spiritual bonds. The immediate consequence of such a theory was to make doubt a matter of necessity, and *change of teaching*, even in the most important truths of religion, the heritage of all time.[3] Doctrinal teachings were now the result of hazard and caprice, and the age of experimental theology seemed to have dawned upon Europe.

But while the principle of anarchy was thus sanctioned and consecrated by the new religious communities, they saw the necessity of

[1] Such is the opinion of the Protestant theologian, *Werenfels*, whose distich, quoted in Vol. I., may be repeated here:—

> "Hic liber est in quo quærit sua dogmata quisque,
> Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua."

[2] Cf. *Lessing's* Axioms against Rev. Pastor Goetze of Hamburg. Complete Works, ed. by *Lachmann*, Vol. X., pp. 133-251. †**Kuhn*, The Formal Principles of Catholicism and Protestantism, being three articles in the Tübingen Quarterly Review of 1858.

[3] *Bossuet*, Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes, Paris, 1740, 2 vols.; or, History of Variations of Protestant Churches, Antwerp, 1742; N. Y., 1836; Dublin, 1842, 2 vols., 8vo. *Planck*, Hist. of the Origin and Changes of the Protestant Dogmas. See above, p. 182.

setting up some sort of authority as an indispensable basis of dogmatic teaching for their spiritual society. To this end the *Books of Symbols* were composed ;[1] but these could not command an enduring authority, for the reason that they were based on human opinion. The Catholic Church had always taught the necessity of good works. Her enemies misrepresented her teachings, and advocated the doctrine of *justification by faith alone.* As time went on, Lutheranism developed into *Protestantism*, or an unqualified protest against certain doctrines, *not because they were false, but because they were taught by the Catholic Church.* Thus Luther, for no other reason than to be opposed to the Pope, would admit Communion neither under one nor both kinds.[2] In the same spirit of childish hostility, the Protestant theologians declined to accept the *calendar* as amended by *Gregory XIII.*, declaring that they could not do so with *a safe conscience*, because the Pope, being Antichrist, took this insidious means of undermining their Church. They had rather be wrong in their astronomical calculations than be corrected by the Pope.[3]

Turbulent passion and wild licentiousness played so conspicuous a part in the Reformation that little or no attention was given to the correction of *morals ;* and accordingly it is not surprising to find Luther complaining that there was a worse Sodom under the Gospel than under the Papacy. *Philip of Hesse* said he must have more than one wife, and the Reformers, with gracious condescension, said his demand was just. And what the early apostles of a pure morality did for Philip, the preachers of Berlin did in 1792 for Frederic William II. of Prussia, who told them that life would not be endurable without the company of the agreeable Miss Doenhof.

To put some sort of check upon the licentiousness of the passions, there was no means left except to adopt the remedy of *Zwingli* and *Calvin*, which was nothing less than an *extravagant ecclesiastical and social despotism.*[4]

[1] Libri Symbolici *Evangelicor.* (Confessio Augustana; Apologia confess. August.; Articuli Smalcaldici; Catechismi Lutheri; Formula Concordiæ), ed. *Hase,* Lps., 1837. Corpus libror. symbol., qui in eccl. *Reformatorum* auctoritatem public. obtinuerunt, ed. *Augusti,* Elberf., 1827. Collectio confessionum in eccl. *reformatis* publicatar., ed. *Niemeyer,* Lps., 1840. (Confessiones helveticæ tres, supplemented with the Catechism of Geneva: Confessio tetrapolitana, viz., Strasburg, Lindau, Constance, and Memmingen; Confessio Gallica; Confessio Scotica, for the Scottish Presbyterian Church; Confessio Anglica, sive XXXIX. Articuli, for the Anglican High Church; Confessiones Belgicæ; Canones Dordraceni XVII; the Catechism of Heidelberg of the Palatinate; Confessio Bohemica; Confessio Hungarica ; Confessiones Poloniæ ; Confessiones Marchiæ, or the Confessions of the March (of Brandenburg). Cf. *Dieringer,* in Aschbach's Eccl. Cyclopæd., art. *Bekenntnisschriften* (Symbolical writings), and "The Symbolical Books of the Protestant Church being at variance with Scripture and Reason," Lps., 1846.

[2] See page 253.

[3] The "*Evangelicals*" persisted in this error, in certain parts of Germany, until 1777; in England until 1752; in Sweden until 1753. The erroneous assumptions of the ancient Julian calendar brought on a difference of ten days in 1582, when the vernal equinox fell on the eleventh day of March.

[4] *Döllinger,* in his works, "The (Protestant) Churches and Civil Liberty," "The Church and the Churches," "The Papacy and the States of the Church," pp. 93-156, gives a very unfavourable account of the lengths to which this tyranny was carried.

If there was one thing above another that was lauded by the Reformers, it was the complete emancipation of the human mind from all superstitious practices; but, strange to say, Luther's silly tales about his absurd conflicts with the devil had a wonderful influence in reviving a *belief in magic and diabolical agencies.*

The want of a reliable and infallible rule of faith produced, as it necessarily must, such crushing feelings of doubt and uncertainty in the mind of Melanchthon, that he candidly confessed the waters of the Elbe could not supply him tears enough to bewail so gigantic a misfortune.[1] As we have seen, the Reformers, while arrogating to themselves the widest liberty of opinion in matters of faith, punished, where they had the power, all those who dared to differ from them with *the penalty of death.* Among the victims of this *intolerance*, besides the executions ordered by Calvin,[2] were *Sylvanus*, a Reformer and inspector of Ladenburg, who was beheaded December 23, 1572, in the market place of Heidelberg,[3] by the advice of Olevian, for denying the Blessed Trinity; *Nicholas Antoine*, a preacher, who was charged with Judaism, and burned alive at Geneva; *Funk*, a follower of Osiander's, who was beheaded in 1601; and the Chancellor *Crell*, a Crypto-Calvinist, who was also beheaded in 1632 at Dresden.[4] Heretics were also executed in Sweden, at Koenigsburg, Lübeck, and other cities.[5] It is noteworthy that these executions were the result, not of passion or intemperate haste, but of cool deliberation and mature judgment. Beza and Melanchthon advocated the *execution of heretics* on general principles, and the latter agreed with Luther in authorizing the *murder of tyrants.*[6] Civil war, an obliteration of the spirit of patriotism, and the introduction of foreigners to settle domestic difficulties were everywhere the consequences of the Reformation. Thus Englishmen were invited to France and Scotland; Frenchmen to Germany; Dutchmen to England; Englishmen to Holland; Russians to Poland; and Turks to Hungary.

§ 336. *The Protestant Clergy—Their Rights—Their Relations to the State.*

Cf. the three excellent articles on the Ecclesiastical Constitution of the Reformation and its constant influence on the Protestant Canonists of the Day (*Stahl, Puchta, Richter,*

---

[1] *Döllinger*, The Reformation and its Internal Development, Vol. I., pp. 280-348; 384 sq.; Vol. III., p. 640 sq.

[2] See page 285 sq.

[3] According to *Hœusser*, Hist. of the Rhenish Palatinate, Vol. II., p. 45 sq., in the Catholic organ of the Diocese of *Freiburg*, year 1864, nros. 8, 9.

[4] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., pp. 528-545.

[5] See *Arnold's* Hist. of the Church, Vol. II., p. 643. Apud *Döllinger*, The Church and the Churches, p. 81.

[6] *Walch's* ed. of Luther's Works, Vol. XXII., pp. 2151 sq. Cf. *Strobel*, Miscellanea, Vol. I., p. 170. *Ukert*, Life of Luther, Vol. II., p. 46, and especially the Essay, inscribed "The Political and Religious Assassination," in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. IX., pp. 737-770.

Klee, &c.), in the *Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 596 sq.; Vol. X., p. 209 sq., p. 529 sq. See also *Walters'* Manual of Canon Law, 13th ed., § 38-42, and *Gieseler's* Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 352-390.

Luther left no means untried to gain the masses, and as he had said, in speaking of the priesthood, that God would destroy "*this lifeless spiritualism*," so he also invested every layman with the *sacerdotal* character, and appealed to Scripture as authority for his act. He soon learned, however, that he had gone too far, and that some sort of authoritative character must necessarily attach to the office of a clergyman. In theory, ministers were to be chosen by the congregations, but in matter of fact the choice lay with the *Consistories*, wherever it had previously belonged to the bishops. These Consistories, which were composed of laymen and ecclesiastics, were empowered to decide all questions relating to marriage, excommunication, and the administration of justice in cases where clergymen were concerned. The articles of parochial visitation published by Augustus, Elector of Saxony (1557), afford some curious information on the subject. "Nobles and other feudal lords," we are told, "gather together from all sides destitute artizans and illiterate boors, and thrust them into parishes, or, it may be, put the habit of a priest upon their own secretaries, their jockeys and their grooms, in order to have shepherds to their own liking, and to secure for themselves as much of the revenues as may be necessary for their needs." As a consequence, the clergy of the Reformed Church were both ignorant and immoral. There being no longer any hierarchical orders, the rights and prerogatives formerly belonging to bishops became the heritage of all pastors.[1] The *scriptural* appellation of "*bishop*" was changed by these hypercritical *biblical* theologians into "superintendent."

In the *Church of England* alone of all the Reformed churches was *the episcopacy held to be of divine institution;* although it seems never to have entered the minds of those who proclaimed this theory that the chain of apostolic succession was broken by the severance of England from the Catholic Church.[2]

Strange to say, the Reformers, having neither an accredited mission nor a valid succession, continued to go through the form of investing their clergymen with ministerial authority. Luther boasted that his commission was extraordinary and of an exclusively divine character. My commission, said he, is not from man, but from God, and conveyed through a special revelation from Christ. But from "*anyone else*, who rashly took upon him to preach the Gospel, he demanded a miraculous authentication of his mission." Luther inconsiderately held out to princes as the price of their good-will the tempting reward of the spoils of churches and convents. They

[1] *Articuli Smalc.* apud *Hase*, Libri symb., p. 354: Constat, jurisdictionem illam communem excommunicandi reos manifestorum criminum pertinere ad omnes Pastores. Hanc tyrannice ad se solos (Episcopos) transtulerunt et ad quæstum contulerunt.

[2] See page 329, note 2.

accepted the bribe with avidity, and having dissolved the monasteries, replaced the peaceful communities of monks with bands of *dissolute soldiers*. Very little, however, of the spoils was devoted to either scientific or religious purposes, or to the social improvement of the people. The wealth thus easily acquired was made to minister to the luxury and pleasure of the new proprietors. Luther raged and stormed, but to no purpose. The ministers of the Gospel, with their wives and children, were starving before his eyes, insulted by the brutal mob, and spurned by the no less brutal nobles, and he was powerless to aid them.

With the help of the princes, Luther and his followers had abolished the sacred privileges of the hierarchy. To the princes they surrendered, sometimes peaceably, and sometimes compelled by force, the supreme spiritual authority, and having done so, they made them their masters, and set up the institution of "*Cæsaropapacy*." This secular supremacy in spiritual affairs was thenceforth unlimited in its claims, and more arrogant in its assumption than the Byzantine despotism of the Lower Empire.[1]

The princes became at once the defenders of the Reformed Church against its external foes, and in some sort the conservators of unity against its own members, whose interminable dissensions and schisms were constantly threatening it with dissolution. It is however somewhat amusing to learn that the *Conventicle of Naumburg* (1554), presided over by Melanchthon, adduced the Scriptural texts, "*Attollite portas, principes, vestras*" (Ps. xxiii. 7, and "*Et erunt reges nutritii tui*" (Isai. xlix. 23) as arguments going to prove the necessity of making the Church dependent upon princes. This is only another instance of the saying that anything may be proved from the Bible.[2]

With these precedents before him, *Stephani* had no difficulty in demonstrating, of course by the authority of the Bible, the existence of that peculiar *episcopal system*, which was taken for granted in the Peace of Augsburg, and according to which the jurisdiction of bishops was transferred to the sovereigns of the countries in which they severally resided. As a consequence, the "*territorial system*," or that embodied in the maxim "*cujus regio, illius religio*," was sanctioned, and some time later found advocates and defenders in the pietists *Thomasius* and *Boehmer*. It was claimed that ecclesiastical supremacy, being essential to the maintenance of public peace, belonged of right to the civil ruler, and that he therefore became, *by virtue of his office as sovereign*, the head of the Church in the country over which he ruled. This principle was by degrees practically carried out in Denmark, where the authority of the king was recognized as absolute in spiritual affairs, and the people were forced to change their religion at

[1] *Döllinger*, The Church and the Churches, etc., p. 53 sq.

[2] See the acts in *Camerarii*, Vita Melanchthonis, ed. *Strobel*, p. 319; Melanchthon's German Scruples, Vol. II.; and in the "Harmless Reports" of 1714, pp. 541-553. Cf. *Menzel*, L. c., Vol. III., p. 530 sq.

his bidding as they would their dress.[1] By the Peace of Westphalia, princes were *legally* invested with the *jus reformandi*. Thus, as in the old Pagan times, so now, there were formed *State Religions*, *National Religions*, and *Religions by Law Established*. This national system received its fullest and most perfect expression in the "*Established Church of England*," but the name would have been more appropriate had the phrase "*Religious Community*" been adopted, instead of the word "Church."

Luther and the English Reformers, in their translations of the New Testament, did not uniformly hit by accident on the term "*community*" or "*congregation*," instead of "*church*."[2] The Reformation placed the Church completely in the power of princes, and the warnings of Luther, the protests of Melanchthon, the more recent theories of the *collegiate system*,"[3] and Calvin's teaching, embodied in the proposition "*ecclesia est sui juris*," have each and all been utterly powerless to rescue Protestant religious communities from the despotism of the State.

§ 337. *Worship and Discipline.*

Bibl. Agendor., ed. by *Kœnig*, Zelle, 1726, 4to. *Funk*, Spirit and Form of the Worship established by Luther, Berlin, 1819. *Grueneisen*, De Protestantismo artibus haud infesto, Stuttg., 1839, 4to. *Gieseler*, Manual of Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 390 sq.

From the foundation of the Church down through every succeeding age, the Sacrifice of the Mass had been the great central act of Catholic worship and the great source of religious and spiritual life But the Reformers did not think so, and they accordingly abolished the Mass, and substituted *preaching* in its stead. The poor and barren word of man took the place of the stupendous and life-giving mystery of God, and it is not wonderful that the interest of the people in religion became enfeebled and their hearts chilled. Once the use of the popular tongue had been introduced in the various rites and ceremonies, it became evident that the people must play a more prominent part in religious assemblies. In 1526, when Luther introduced for the first time his own form of worship and ecclesiastical organization, conscious, *for the moment*, of their many deficiencies, he considerately announced that it was not his purpose to abridge anyone's religious freedom, nor did he intend to prescribe his own ritual as something permanent and unchangeable.[4] Consistently with his contemptuous hatred of whatever evoked a memory of the old Church, and with his exclusive and narrow-minded views of the apostolic age, he manifested a barbarous aversion to the glorious creations of *Christian*

[1] Concerning the arbitrary methods of princes in dealing with spiritual affairs, cf. *Wolfgang Menzel*, Hist. of the Germans, ch. 420. It was a common remark that the wives of these truculent ministers used to be constantly saying to them : "Write, my dear husband, write in such a way that you may not lose your parish."

[2] Cf. Dr. *Sylvius*, the Church and the Gospel, or Catholic Protestation against Protestantism calling itself a "*Church*," Ratisbon, 1843.

[3] Advocated later on, especially by *Pfaff*. Cf. § 375.

[4] *Walch*, Works of Luther, Vol. X., p. 266 sq.

art, and once more *revived* by the destruction of images the spirit of *iconoclasm*, which received a fresh impulse from the almost forgotten *Caroline Books*,[1] now for the first time issued from the printer's press. But his judgment of art and its influence was materially modified by the stand he was obliged to take against the iconoclastic fury of Carlstadt, and he sometimes condescended to speak with admiration of *Albert Dürer* and *Luke Cranach*. The sphere in which artistic genius was permitted to move by the requirements of the Reformed system was, however, very limited.

The *cycle of feasts* had been greatly reduced, but still, notwithstanding that there were many places in which the old Germans delighted in celebrating the festivals of the Blessed Virgin, the artist was forbidden to represent her as the *Sorrowful Mother of God*.

Of all the arts, Luther delighted most in *music*.[2] He introduced popular church-song, the text of which was chiefly borrowed from the old hymns of the Church, partly from the canticles of the Bohemian Brethren, and partly composed by himself. The best of his religious songs are taken from an ancient collection of Catholic hymns, among which may be instanced the ones beginning: "There came an angel bright and fair" (Es kam ein Engel hell und klar); "In the midst of life are we" (Mitten wir im Leben sind); and, "O head with blood and wounds unsightly made" (O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden, etc.) Religious songs that are wholly Protestant in origin are so dogmatic in tone and contradictory in spirit that when they are not disgusting they are ludicrous. Those of the Anabaptists and Moravian Brethren, when not stupidly dull and moralizing, are fantastic and licentious.[3] From what has been said, it should not be inferred that Luther is the father of *German* church-song. On the contrary, hymn-books in use in the Catholic Church[4] long anterior to Luther contain choral melodies which were very generally sung everywhere by the people during divine service. During the Middle Ages, monasteries were not only nurseries of learning, they were also the home of the arts, none of which was cultivated with more care and assiduity than music, and particular attention was given to the soul-inspiring choral-song.

[1] See Vol. II., p. 160.

[2] *Walch*, Luther's Works, Vol. X., p. 1723.

[3] The following expositions of the Lutheran teaching on *justification*, and the contemptuous *expressions relative to the Pope*, are among the more remarkable specimens:

"Herr Jesu nimm mich Hund beim Ohr
Wirf mir den Gnadenknochen vor;
Und schmeiss mich Sündenlümmel
In deinen Gnaden Himmel.

Nun das ist doch die Sache
Daran uns Alles liegt;
Lamm, nimm uns in die Mache
Und mach uns recht vergnügt.

Erhalt uns Gott bei deinem Wort
Und steur' des Papst und Türken Mord,
Die Jesum deinen Sohn
Stürzen wollen von seinem Thron."

Cf. *Buchmann*, Popular Symbolism, 2nd ed., Mentz, 1844; Vol. I., pp. 8-10; Vol. II., p. 193.

[4] See p. 156.

Luther drew his melodies from the antiphoners of the Catholic Church, and set them to German text. *Walther*, *Selneccer*, and *Burk* did the same, their melodies being only imitations of Catholic Church songs. Since the investigations of *Meister* have been made public, it has become a matter of very serious doubt whether Luther is really the author of a *single one* of the melodies attributed to him.[1] Luther had only retained two Sacraments, viz., *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, but, as a badge of distinction between his own and the "*heretical*" Reformed Church, he kept also the Sacramental of Exorcism. When *Crell*, the Chancellor to Christian I., Elector of Saxony, desiring to harmonize the extreme views of the Lutherans and Calvinists, made an attempt to abolish exorcism, the Lutheran clergy of Zeitz and Dresden incited the people to rise against him. "There was a diabolical malice in the joy manifested by the coterie of theologians and jurists in being able to keep Crell shut up in a squalid dungeon. When the poor man, emaciated and half dead, was brought forth from his confined and noisome den on the Koenigstein, it was only to be decapitated at Dresden. The executioner cried out: 'This is indeed a Calvinistic blow.'"

When it became evident that the much-lauded principles of *Christian freedom* were not productive of the best fruits, and that they sometimes conflicted with the *official theology* of princes, a more severe discipline was introduced. To enforce it, recourse was had to fines, exclusion from the Lord's Supper, and denial of the privileges of ecclesiastical sepulture. The character of the discipline of the Reformed Churches of Scotland and Geneva[2] was gloomy and repulsive; and in many parts of Germany, notably in Weimar, Jena, and Brunswick, it degenerated into absolute cruelty.[3] In the last-named city, *Henning Brabant*[4] overthrew the aristocratic government, and in its stead set up a democracy, which, strange to say, proclaiming itself an enemy of all tyranny, was quite as impatient of the yoke of the clergy as it had been of that of the aristocracy. Henning was solemnly excommunicated by the Lutherans, who, to incite the hostility of the people against him, spread the rumour that they had seen him pursued through the streets of the city by the devil under the guise of a raven. The credulous and superstitious inhabitants deserted their leader, and permitted him to be seized and put to inhuman torture. His limbs were dislocated and severed upon the rack, his body indecently mutilated, and an end was not put to his

[1] *C. Winterfeld*, Dr. Martin Luther's Religious Songs, together with the System of Music employed during his Lifetime, &c., Lps., 1841. Against that, *Meister*, The Catholic German Church-song and System of Music, Freiburg, 1862, 2 vols.; see Vol. I., pp. 29, 30.

[2] *Zeller*, The Theological System of Zwinglius, Tübing, 1853, p. 16 sq. *Kober*, Excommunication, Tübing, 1857, p. 16 sq.

[3] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., pp. 528-545.

[4] *Strombeck*, Henning Brabant, Burgomaster of the City of Brunswick, and his Contemporaries, Brunswick, 1829. *A. Menzel*, L. c., Vol. V., p. 229. See also *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 319, and "*Melanchthon's* View."

terrible sufferings until after his ferocious executioners had torn out his heart, and struck the dying man on the mouth with it. This indomitable man expired September 17, 1604, and his last words were those of indignant rebuke. "This," said he, "is what is called fighting for one's country."

§ 338. *Protestant Exegetics.*

See Vol. II., § 286, for sources on this subject. *Reuss*, Hist. of Holy Writ, 4th ed., Brunswick.

The early Reformers despised all purely human learning, demanding that the works of Plato and those of Aristotle, "that destroyer of souls, who knew next to nothing of philosophy," should be burned; and the more this aversion increased, the more did they extol Holy Scripture, representing it as the *one* source of faith, and *claiming the widest inspiration for its contents*.[1] Luther gave a clear and intelligible exposition of certain portions of *Genesis*, the *Psalter*, and the *Epistle to the Galatians*, often translating and drawing out the meaning of the words of Holy Writ in simple, popular, and persuasive language; but at times interspersing his comments with coarse invectives, "distorting," as Zasius says, "the whole Bible into a series of menaces and curses against popes, bishops, and priests."

Melanchthon began the study of the Scriptures at an early age, and, by his extensive knowledge of Hebrew, was enabled to give a tolerably satisfactory explanation of the literal sense of the Old Testament. Following the rule of St. Augustine, that only by a knowledge of the New Testament can a full understanding be had of the Old, he supplemented his work by the addition of dogmatical and allegorical commentaries.

Matthew Flacius endeavoured to reduce exegetics to a scientific system (*Clavis Sacræ Scripturæ*), a plan which he pursued in his work entitled "A Compendium of the New Testament" (*Glossa Compendiaria in N. T.*) These labours on Holy Scripture were still further advanced by *Wolfgang Franz* in his Hermeneutics (*Tractatus theologicus*, etc., Vit. 1619), and by *Solomon Glassius* in his Sacred Philology (*Philologia sacra*). Other Lutheran interpreters, like *Wolfgang Musculus* († 1563), *David Chytræus*, and *Martin Chemnitz*, following in the wake of those who had gone before them, never lost sight of their Confession, as set forth in their *Books of Symbols* (*Regula seu analogia fidei*), when writing *polemical* commentaries on the text of Holy Writ. They were impatient of whatever seemed contradictory to the teaching of the Bible, and hence their ignorant hostility to the discoveries of the great *Kepler*.[2]

[1] Codicem hebræum V. T. tunc quoad consonas tunc quoad vocalia sive puncta ipsa sive punctorum saltem potestatem et tum quoad *res* tum quoad *verba* θεόπνευστον esse. (Formula consensus helvetica can II.)

[2] Cf. *Wolfg. Menzel*, Hist. of the German c .430. *Baron de Breitschwerdt*, The Life and Labours of John Kepler, Stuttg., 1831. *C. Gruner*, John Kepler, Stuttg., 1868. *A. Menzel*, Vol. V., pp. 117-126.

In the Reformed Church, *Calvin*,[1] following in the footsteps of the Reformers *Zwingli*, *Œcolampadius*, *Bucer*, and *Leo Judæ*, the German translator of the Bible, all of whom were acute scriptural commentators, and approaching the study of Holy Writ in a profoundly religious frame of mind, seems to have caught the spirit of the elevated thoughts it contains, and to have set them forth with unusual clearness. This is especially noticeable in his commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul. He rarely deviates from the rule that "*brevity and clearness are the chief merits of an interpreter*;" but he is frequently most unscrupulous and audacious in his attempts to make St. Paul responsible for his own rigorous and repulsive system. The Latin translation of the Bible by *Sebastian Castellio* possessed all the elegance and purity of the classic age, but it was no longer the Bible, and even the style had lost its masculine vigour and peculiar character. This stimulated *Theodore Beza*, who called it "the work of Satan," to make another translation, in which he endeavoured to preserve the Oriental peculiarities of style.

We are chiefly indebted for the progress made in philological exegetics to *Conrad Pelican*, and next to him the honour is shared by the *Buxtorfs*, father and son, professors of the Oriental languages at Basle, who brought to their work vast stores of Talmudic and Rabbinic lore.[2] *Thomas Erpenius* († 1627) and his celebrated scholar, *James Golius*,[3] contributed largely towards facilitating the study of the Arabic dialect; and *Samuel Bochart* illustrated the geography (*Phaleg et Kanaan*) and natural history (*Hierozoicon*) of the Bible. While these labours were in progress, a controversy arose concerning the origin of the Hebrew vowel-points (*Louis Capellus*) and the purity of the Greek in the New Testament (*Henri Etienne*). Rising above the prejudices of his predecessors, *Hugo Grotius*,[4] the most distinguished humanist of his age, in his commentaries on the Old and New Testaments, written with commendable impartiality, and showing an extensive acquaintance with philology, paid little attention to the question of inspiration or to the plan of harmonising the Sacred Text with the Book of Symbols, disregarding in these particulars the traditionary methods of his own sect. His example led the way to a better feeling and to the adoption of more temperate views in religious matters. *Coccejus*, a professor of Leyden, took a directly opposite course; and so marked was the antagonism between the two, and so dissimilar their methods, that it became a common saying among the

[1] This exegetical work has but recently been published in two editions, and recommended by *Tholuck* in his *Literary Index*, year 1831, nros. 41 sq.; its merits are more critically estimated by *Fritzsche*, in his Essay on the services rendered by Tholuck to the cause of biblical interpretation, Halle, 1831, p. 109. *Escher*, De Calvino, N. T. interprete, Ultraj., 1841.

[2] Lexicon chaldaicum, talmudicum, et rabbinicum, completed by his son, 1640.

[3] His Arabic dictionary remained down to our own day, and previously to the publication of that by *Freytag*, the very best in use for the study of the language.

[4] Annotationes ad V. T., Par., 1644, ed. *Doederlein*, Halæ, 1775 sq., 3 T., 4to. Annotationes in N. T., 1641 sq., 2 T., ed. *Windheim*, Halæ, 1769, 2 T., 4to.

orthodox zealots, that the one found Christ everywhere in Scripture and the other not at all.[1]

§ 339. *Mystics and Visionaries.*

Arnold, though not free from prejudice, treats this subject with greater fulness than any other author, in his History of the Church and Heresies. *Kromayer*, De Weigelianismo, Rosæ-crucianismo et Paracelso, Lps., 1669. *Gieseler*, Manual of Ch. Hist., Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 433 sq. *Henry Schmid*, Hist. of Pietism, Noerdlingen, 1863.

The religious tendency of the works of *John Tauler*, *Thomas à Kempis*, and the earlier mystics, and notably of the author of the *German Theology*, had exercised a powerful influence upon Luther and other members of the various Protestant denominations. The interior spirit which they tended to foster is quite perceptible in the work "*On True Christianity*," in four books (after 1605), by *John Arndt*, Superintendent of Lüneburg († 1621). This work, portions of which are literally, and the whole of it substantially, pirated from the writings of earlier mystical authors, has obtained a lasting popularity.[2] The same spirit pervades the works of *John Gerhard*, professor at Jena († 1637), in whose profound, yet tender theology (*Loci theologici; Confessio theologica*), a strong tendency towards mysticism (*Schola pietatis*) is plainly visible. It is still more prominent in the "Kiss of Spiritual Love" and the "Hours of Spiritual Edification" (*Geistlicher Liebeskuss; Geistliche Erquickstunden*), by *Henry Müller*, of Rostock († 1675); in the "Spiritual Treasure of the Soul," and "Theophilus' Occasional Devotions" (*Geistlicher Seelenschatz; Gotthold's zufällige Andachten*), by *Christian Scriver*, of Rendsburg († 1693); and pre-eminently so in the "Sacred Songs" of the pious *Paul Gerhard*. Born in the year 1606, in the Electorate of Saxony, he afterwards became a deacon of the Church of St. Nicholas, in Berlin, whence he was obliged to fly, because he had opposed the union between the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches (1666), and he ended his days as chief pastor of Lüben, in Lusatia, in 1676. It was during the darkest period of his life, when weighed down with grief and sorrow, and persecuted by everyone, that he wrote his most exquisite hymns. The tender religious feeling and deep pathos expressed in the lyrics "Unto the Lord commend thy ways;" and "Rejoice, my heart, and sing" (*Befiehl du deine Wege; Wach auf mein Herz und singe*), will attest to coming generations how pure and holy was the poetical fire that glowed in the bosom in this exemplary pulpit orator.[3]

[1] *Hossbach*, Spener and his Age, 2nd ed., by Schweder, Berlin, 1853, p. 185.

[2] New edition, with biographical notices, by *Krummacher*, Lps., 1847, and by the Evangelical Book concern, Berlin, 1847. Cf. *Niedner*, Hist. of the Christian Church, p. 759.

[3] Spiritual Hymns of *Paul Gerhard*, according to the edition published during his life, Stuttg., 1843. *Trepte*, P. Gerhard, Delitsch, 1828. *Roth*, P. Gerhard, L s., 829. New ed. by *Wackernagel*, Stuttg., 1855.

According to the theory of *Valentine Weigel*,[1] a preacher at Meissen, there exists an interior illumination, revealing to man the true meaning of the Word of God, as set forth in Holy Writ, and guiding him to a knowledge of true science. In comparison of this inspired knowledge, all purely human learning is empty and calculated only to lead the mind astray. Weigel also held that Christ came upon the earth in the guise of flesh and blood, and this doctrine gave rise to the sect of the *Weigelians*.

In the writings of *Paracelsus* (i. e., Hohenheim) mysticism assumed a theosophic[2] character. Paracelsus was a Swiss physician, born at Maria Einsiedeln, about the year 1493, and died a Catholic at Salzburg in 1541. While leading a roaming life, he was a diligent chemist, and is the accredited author of a religious system, which is a compound of theology, medicine, chemistry, physics, and natural history.[3] He held that the action of God in the order of grace is analogous to that in the order of nature. Hence, he said, chemistry furnishes the key to the various changes that go on, not only in the material, but also in the spiritual world, and by its agency and instrumentality man should be able to discover the elixir of life and the philosopher's stone.

This same idea was developed with striking originality by *Jacob Böhme*, a cobbler of Görlitz († 1624), who from his very infancy fancied he had divine revelations,[4] and in his mystical system professed to make the mysteries of the spirit perfectly intelligible by means of the symbols and formulæ of chemistry and physics. His views were the views of a visionary, vast and gorgeous, but lacking in definiteness and eluding his mental grasp; and his ideas, though strikingly profound, were obscure and involved in inextricable confusion. The diffusion of these mysterious doctrines led to the belief in the existence of a secret society, which, possessing some occult knowledge of nature and the philosopher's stone, was silently preparing the way for the regeneration of the moral world; whose leader was an unknown man named *Rosenkreuz*, and whose origin was lost in the dim mist of ages (*Rosicrucians*). It is likely that the belief in the *existence* of such a society was strengthened by the writings of *John*

[1] The Golden Rule (*Der güldene Griff*), or an Unerring Guide to all Knowledge, Neustadt, 1617, 4to. To his school belongs Theologia Weigelii (i. e., profession of faith), Neustadt, 1618, 4to. Cf. Francis von *Baader's* Lectures on the Doctrine of Bœhme (Pt. II., Vol. IV., of Baader's Complete Works). *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 723-726.

[2] Theosophist is a generic appellation for those Mystics who claimed to obtain a knowledge of the mysteries of being by an internal and supernatural illumination. This knowledge was twofold, embracing both the natural and the supernatural. The Theosophists were also called Fire-philosophers. (Tr.)

[3] His Works, Basle, 1589 sq., 5 vols., in 4to. *Rixner* and *Siber*, The Life and Doctrines of Celebrated Physicians, 1829, nro. 1. *Preu*, Theology of Paracelsus, Berlin, 1839.

[4] See his works, edited by *Gichtel*, Amst., 1682, 2 vols., 4to; 1730, 6 vols., by *Scheibler* Lps., 1831 sq. *Wuller*, The Life and Doctrine of Jacob Boehme, Stuttg., 1836. Cf., above all, *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 726-740.

Valentine Andreä (†1654), who, in his three works, "*The Chemical Affinities of Christian Rosenkreuz*,"[1] "*The Fame of the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross*," and "*The Confession of the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross*," gave an ideal description of an association of this character. Its aim and duty, according to him, were the study of nature and the search after truth. It is probable, however, that his object in these works was not to found or promote secret societies, but rather to satirise and ridicule the follies of his age.

It is not a little strange that men of learning and ability should have been duped by the pretensions of the Rosicrucians. *Robert Fludd* (Robertus de Fluctibus, †1637) an English physician of liberal education, by combining the theories of the Rosicrucians with the vagaries of Paracelsus, became the author of what is known as the Fire-philosophy.[2]

§ 340. *Controversies within the Reformed and Lutheran Churches.*

Planck, The Protestant System, Vols. IV.-VI., and Hist. of Protestant Theology from the Formula of Concord to the middle of the eighteenth century, Göttingen, 1831. *Heppe*, Hist. of German Protestantism, 1555-1581, Marburg, 1852 sq., 4 vols. *Gieseler*, Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 187 sq. **Hasse*, Ch. H., ed. by *Kœhler*, Vol. III., p. 110-131. *Bossuet*, Hist. of the Variations, &c. **Döllinger*, The Reformation, its Development, &c., Vol III. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 330 sq.

There were exciting controversies among the Protestants, even while they were still in fierce conflict with the Catholic Church. Some of them have been already mentioned. The following summary which will complete the history of the dissensions by which the Protestant Church was rent from the date of its origin, will also indicate the necessary tendency of the principles upon which it is based:

A.—CONTROVERSIES AMONG THE LUTHERANS.

1. *Antinomian controversy.*—In his Formulary of Ecclesiastical Visitation, Melanchthon had given directions to preachers to insist upon the binding force of the *Law* in exhorting men to repentance, as an efficient means of producing a wholesome fear of God, without which no sincere penitence is possible. To this instruction *John Agricola*, a professor of Wittenberg (1536), and afterwards chaplain at the Court of Berlin (1540), took exception. Knowing that Catholics insisted on good works, he took an opposite course, maintaining that

[1] The Fama Fraternitatis R. C. was published at Cassel in 1614; the Confessio Fraternitatis R. C. in 1615; and the Chemical Affinities in 1618. See also Andreä's autobiography, transl. fr. the Latin by *Seybold*, Winterthur, 1799, and *Hossbach*, Jno. Val. Andreä and his Age, Berlin, 1819. The Apap of Andreä Unmasked; together with different essays, illustrative of the ecclesiastical history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, by *Papst*, Lps., 1827. **Chr. Gottlieb von Murr*, On the True Origin of the Rosicrucians and Freemasons, Sulzbach, 1803. Cf. *Sigwart*, Hist. of Philosophy, Vol. II., pp. 51-69, and pp. 449 sq. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. IX., pp. 339-403. Fr. tr., Vol. 20, pp. 443, together with full bibliography.

[2] His medical and philosophical works were published in French and Latin at Oppenheim and Goude in 1617, 5 vols., fol.

the *Gospel* alone should be preached to Christians. In 1537, in a disputation at Wittenberg, he opposed even Luther, asserting that the Ten Commandments, or the *Law of Moses*, should not be set up as motives to penitence, but only the sufferings and death of the Son of God, according to the teaching of St. Luke, xxiv. 26; St. John, xvi. 8; and Philipp. ii. 5, 12. Luther replied in six dissertations, showing that the Law gives man the consciousness of sin, and that the fear of the Law is both wholesome and necessary for the preservation of morality, and of divine as well as human institutions.[1] Agricola made an humble recantation.[2] This controversy was virtually a refutation of Luther's earlier assertion that man had lost his capacity for doing good. Luther so far modified this assertion as to admit that motives of fear should be employed to lead man to do good; while Agricola maintained that no motive other than love should be employed. The latter, however, failed to distinguish between the Law of Moses and the moral Law of Christ.

2. *Controversy on good works.*—Out of hatred to the Catholic Church, Luther had persistently rejected good works. Melanchthon saw the dangerous results to which this extravagant denial would lead, and set himself to correct it. In the *Augsburg Confession*, but chiefly in the revised edition of his *Loci* or *Hypotyposes* (1535), he affirmed the *necessity of good works* as emphatically as any Catholic could have done. *Amsdorf* at once proceeded to unmask this false brother, and in a discussion with *George Major*, preacher at the castle of Wittenberg, he went the length of quoting St. Paul, whom he supplemented with the authority of Luther, for the doctrine "*that good works are actually prejudicial to salvation.*" The *Religious Conference of Altenburg* (1560), which, it was hoped, would heal these dissensions, served only to intensify them.[3] Notwithstanding that Amsdorf, following the example of forbearance set him by Melanchthon, suppressed the words "*to salvation*" (1562), which had given most offence, the controversy was not closed until after his death, which happened in 1574.

3. *The synergistic controversy.*—Starting with the principle of absolute predestination, Luther had asserted that justification is *wholly the work of God*, and altogether independent of the works of the person justified.[4] With a view to soften the harshness and mitigate the terrors of this doctrine, Melanchthon, in the editions of

[1] *Walch*, Works of Luther, Vol. XX., p. 2014 sq. *Melanchth.*, Epp., T. I.. p. 915. *Elwert*, De antinomia Agricolæ, Tur., 1837. *Nitsch*, On the Law, &c., the Gospel (German Periodical, 1851, nro. 10).

[2] Mosheim confesses that the recantation he made, when pressed by Luther, was not sincere, and considers Agricola to be chargeable with vanity, presumption, and artifice. (Tr.)

[3] Acta colloquii Altenburg., Lps., 1570, fol. *Locher*, Ad hist. colloq. Altenburg. animadversion, Altenburgi, 1776, 4to.

[4] "Non ille justus est qui multum operatur; sed qui sine opere multum credit in Christum," was one of the "Paradoxes" he offered to maintain against all comers at Heidelburg in 1518. (Tr.)

his "*Hypotyposes Theologicæ*," published in 1535 and 1543, stated plainly that "God so draws and converts adults that some agency of their wills accompanies his influences." There are three agencies, he went on to say, conspiring in the work of man's justification, viz., the word of God, the Holy Ghost, and the will of man. This view of the co-operation (συνεργισμός) of the will of man with the grace of God was afterwards incorporated in the Interim of Leipsig, and was defended by Pfeffinger in a dissertation published by him in the same city. Of this publication *Amsdorf* wrote a refutation.

The professors of the University of Jena, which had been founded, in 1547, as a nursery for the propagation and defence of pure Lutheranism, took up the controversy, and maintained that in consequence of original sin, the will of man, far from co-operating with the grace of God, was a positive hindrance to its action. This view was accepted at the Court of Weimar, whose influence and authority were exerted in support of the opponents of Synergism (1560). But the doctrine found favour even at Jena, and *Victorinus Strigel*, its ablest defender, atoned for his boldness by imprisonment. *Flacius* was chiefly instrumental in bringing Strigel to punishment. In a disputation that took place between them at Weimar in 1560, the former maintained that original sin was not merely an *accident* in man, as Strigel claimed, but of his very *substance;* from which the obvious conclusion was drawn that man is a creature of Satan, and incapable of being redeemed. By a doctrine so revolting, Flacius alienated the affection of his friends, before whose hostility he was obliged to fly. He died at Frankfort, March 11, 1575, in a state of destitution.[1]

4. *The Osiandrist controversy.*—The opinions of Agricola were again revived by *Andrew Osiander* in his inaugural address (1549) as head of the Theological Faculty of the newly-founded University of Koenigsberg. He also combated Luther's teaching on justification, maintaining that man is justified, not by imputation or a *judicial sentence of God declaring him so, but by an actual indwelling of Christ as God making him so;* and, hence that *sanctification* is an essential condition to justification. As a corollary to this, he held that justification is wrought in man by the power of the *Divine* and not of the Human Nature of Christ.[2] This doctrine was opposed not only at Koenigsberg, but in many other cities of Germany. Among those most conspicuous for their active hostility to it were *Staphylus* of Osnabrück, and *Francis Stancari*, both of whom were professors at Koenigsberg. Stancari was an Italian, who had been expelled for

[1] *Ritter*, The Life and Death of Flacius, Frankfort and Lps. (1723.) *Twesten*, Flac. Illyr., &c., Berlin, 1844. *Schmid*, Flacius' Controversy on Original Sin, from a hist. and lit. point of view (Journal of Hist. Theology, year 1849, nro. 1). *Frank*, De Matth. Flac. in libros sacros meritis, Jenæ, 1859. *Perger*, Matth. Flac. Illyr. and his Age, Erlangen, 1859 sq. *Otto*, De Victorino Strigelio, liberioris mentis eccles. Luther vindice, Jenæ, 1843.

[2] *Wilken*, The Life, Doctrine, and Writings of Osiander I., Stralsund, 1844. *Hæberle*, The Doctrine of Osiander (Studies and Criticisms, 1844). *Ritschl*, Osiander's Doctrine of Justification (Annuary of Germ. Theol., by Dorner and Liebner II., nro. 4).

his heretical opinions from the University of Mantua. From Mantua he went to Switzerland, whence he was also expelled by the Calvinists, and in 1548 became professor of Hebrew at the university over whose Theological Faculty Osiander presided. His views on justification were diametrically opposed to those of Osiander. He maintained that the mediatorship of Christ is to be attributed to his *Human*, and not to his *Divine* Nature. Numerous opponents at once rose up against him; fierce controversies broke out among the professors; and the conviction began to dawn upon Duke Albert that in founding the University of Koenigsberg he had been the author of a scourge for himself rather than a blessing. The hearts of its members were filled with feelings of hatred and envy, and, ranging themselves into hostile camps, some became the partizans of Flacius, while others, encouraged by the sympathy of the old aristocracy of the country, formed an opposition party under the lead of *Joachim Moerlin*, a preacher of Koenigsberg.

The whole country was soon in arms against both Osiander and Stancari. The court gave its support to Osiander, after whose death, in 1552, his son-in-law, *John Funk*, became the representative and defender of his opinions.

Stancari, quitting Koenigsberg, passed into Poland, where he became a furious iconoclast; and, after a life spent in roving and fierce controversy, died in the year 1574. So dissolute were the habits of Moerlin, and withal so prodigious his intellectual activity, that some persons, at a loss to account in any other way for his incessant literary labours, seriously asserted that while he was drunk at the festive board the devil took his place at the writing-desk. Moerlin died in 1571, and *Hesshusius*,[1] who succeeded to his leadership, was deprived of this honour, as he had previously been of so many others, for maintaining that Christ should be adored, not only as a *concrete* being, but in his flesh considered *apart* and *independently*, of any of his other attributes. The controversy spread over the whole of Prussia, working everywhere manifestations of the fiercest animosity, and was terminated only after the execution of Funk and the publication of the *Corpus doctrinæ Prutenicum*, in which Osiander's doctrine was condemned as essentially heretical, and that of Luther declared to be of equal authority with the Symbols.

5. *Crypto-Calvinism.*—Melanchthon, the author of the Augsburg Confession, had, from the very beginning, been suspected of playing an equivocal part with regard to the doctrine of the Eucharist.[2] Under any circumstances, such duplicity could not remain long concealed, and after the Interim of Leipsig his real sentiments became a matter of notoriety. As a consequence, the divergent views on the Lord's Supper gave rise to two parties, known respectively as the

[1] Cf. *Wiggers*, Tilemann Hesshusius and John Draconites, Rostock, 1854. *Wilkens*, T. Hesshusius, a Polemical Theologian of the Lutheran Church, Lps., 1869. *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. V., pp. 151, 152.

[2] See § 316, vers. fin.

Lutherans and the *Philippists*. Melanchthon's teaching concerning the *Adiaphora* was also violently assailed by *Matthew Flacius* of Magdeburg, who maintained that the points which the doctor claimed were matters of indifference could not be so regarded. Towards the close of his life, Melanchthon inclined towards Calvin's teaching concerning the Lord's Supper, and, without saying a word to anyone on the subject, changed the tenth article of the Confession of Augsburg in such a way as to express his own belief. He was driven to make this change by the course of *Brenz*, who, besides proclaiming his belief in the theory of the omnipresence or *ubiquity of the Body of Christ*, made the doctrine obligatory upon the Church of Würtemberg.

The contests between the two parties were bitter and vehement. The Philippists were anxious not to alienate the affections of Augustus, Elector of Saxony, who professed the doctrine of Luther, though he knew as little about it as his butler. By the Convention of Torgau (1574), therefore, they put on the semblance of Lutheranism, while they detested its reality. But Melanchthon was not without friends at court. He had there a considerable and quite an influential party, at the head of which was his son-in-law, *Peucer*, physician in ordinary, and one of the privy councillors to the Elector. *Wigand* and *Hesshusius*, the most ardent champions of the Lutheran doctrine on the Lord's Supper, were expelled from Jena in 1573.

The Philippists, now believing themselves all powerful, began to speak openly of rejecting the teachings of Luther; but this candid avowal of their sentiments roused popular indignation against them. Public prayers were offered up in all the churches of Saxony for the extirpation of the Calvinistic heresy; a medal was struck commemorating the triumph of Christ over the devil and human reason; and of the theologians many ended their days in prison, while others, among whom was the physician, Peucer, languished there for years.[1]

6. *Efforts at Concord, or the Form and Book of Concord.*—The Protestants soon foresaw that these animated controversies and heated discussions, if permitted to go on, would in the end compromise their political supremacy, and they accordingly began to manifest a less obstinate and more accommodating spirit in their dogmatic opinions. In that rigid age the only way of effecting a reconciliation and securing unanimity was by drafting a Confession on strictly scientific principles, which would be acceptable to all. To this work *Jacob Andreä*, the laborious and versatile Chancellor of Tübingen, applied himself. He addressed the princes of the different countries on the reunion of the various sections of Protestantism, and was at first repelled by them all, but finally obtained recognition from Elector *Augustus* of Saxony, who took an active interest in the project. Putting him-

[1] *Peuceri* Historia carcerum et liberation. divin., ed. *Pezel*, Tig., 1605. *Frimel*, Witteberga a Calv. divexata et divinitus liberata, or Report of the manner in which the sacramentary demon penetrated into Saxony, Witt., 1646, 4to. *Walch*, Bibliotheca theologica, T. II., p. 588 sq *Calinich*, Struggle and Fall of Melanchthonism in Electoral Saxony, Lps., 1866

self at the head of the movement, he called a conference, in which the theologians *Martin Chemnitz*, superintendent of Brunswick; *Chytraeus*, a professor of Rostock, and many other divines participated. The result of their labours was the *Book of Torgau*. Taking this as a basis, a number of clergymen, who met at the monastery of *Bergen*, drew up a new symbol, and, after many corrections, finally completed it, May 28, 1577. It was designated the Form of Concord (*Formula Concordiæ*). Its principal authors were *Andreä*, *Selnecker*, and *Chemnitz*. The document was drawn with care; everything that might give offence was omitted; everything that had the flavour of Philippism studiously avoided; the system of Luther[1] was skilfully elaborated and defended; and it was hoped it would prove acceptable to all parties. But no sooner had the Philippists learned that the Calvinistic views had been formally condemned than they protested, and the Form of Concord became a *Form of Discord* (*Concordia discors*),[2] as it was termed by its opponents. It was, however, adopted by the States of the empire, with a few exceptions, at the Imperial Diet of Dresden, June 25, 1580, and was made of equal authority in matters of faith with the ancient œcumenical councils, the original unchanged Confession of Augsburg, the Apology, the Articles of Smalkald, and the Catechisms of Luther. All these were collectively called the *Book of Concord*, which has always been regarded as the *Great Charter* of German Lutheranism.

The Philippists of the Electorate of Saxony were for the time vanquished; but as they still existed in considerable numbers, and were as tenacious as ever of the opinions, which they ceased to proclaim only because they dreaded the tyranny of princes, they were prompt in turning to their advantage the political changes of the year 1586. The elector, Christian I., and his chancellor, *Nicholas Crell*, were gained to Calvinism, and plans were at once formed for a *gradual* union between the Calvinists and Lutherans. All controversial sermons were forbidden; the most important positions in the parishes and schools were filled by Philippists; subscriptions to the Book of Concord were suspended; and a translation of the Bible, reflecting the spirit of Melanchthon, was commenced. But, in the midst of these preparations, the young prince passed away (1591), and no sooner had *William I.*, Duke of Saxe-Altenburg, the guardian of the heir to Christian I., assumed the duties of government than rigid Lutheranism was again restored. *Articles of Visitation*, drawn up in a spirit of deadly hostility to Calvinism, were published at Torgau in 1592, and all officers of Church and State were required to accept them under oath.

[1] This Formula concordiæ apud *Hase*, Libri symb., pp. 570-830. Conf. also, in the Prolegom. locus VII. de Formul concord. ac Libro concordiæ, p. CXXXIV. sq.

[2] *Hospiniani*, Concordia discors, Tig., 1608, Gen., 1678. *Hutteri*, Conc. concors, Vit. 1614, Lps., 1690, 4to. *Anton*, Hist. of the Form of Concord, Lps., 1779, 2 vols. *Goeschel*, The Form of Concord, its Hist., Doctrine, and Influence, Lps., 1858. *Frank*, The Theology of the Form of Concord, Erlangen, 1858.

7. *Syncretistic controversy.*[1]—The author of this controversy was *George Calixtus*, a professor at the University of Helmstaedt, and an honest and highly educated man. Like Melanchthon, he was of a conciliatory disposition. He showed that the teachings of the Wittenberg theologians *on the ubiquity of the Body of Christ and the communication of his two Natures* (*Communicatio idiomatum*), as set forth in the Form of Concord, were Eutychian conceptions. The ill-will which this candid avowal excited against him was still further intensified by the publication of his "*Epitome theologiæ*" (1619), in which scant notice was taken of those characteristically Catholic and Calvinistic doctrines so obnoxious to the Lutherans. His "*Epitome theologiæ moralis*" (1634) gave still deeper offence. In this work, while speaking of the return of *Bartholomew Nihus* to the Catholic Church, he took occasion to say that there were many points in controversy between Catholics and Protestants having no essential bearing on the principles of faith, and that the hope of salvation could not be denied to such well-meaning Catholics as, blinded by the prejudices of birth and education, were sincerely attached to the teachings of their religion. Learning the course pursued by him at the fruitless Religious Conference of Thorn, the Saxon theologians, *Werner*, *Hülseman*, *Scherpf*, and *Calovius*, became his fiercest opponents. They could not endure, they said, such an amalgamation of conflicting beliefs (*Syncretism*). Out of this quarrel grew the *Syncretistic Controversy*, which also revived the discussions on original sin, justification, good works, and the Lord's Supper. The Saxon theologians, by accusing Calixtus of desiring to unite in one brotherhood with the Lutherans, not alone Papists and Calvinists, but also Socinians, Arminians, and even Turks and Jews, alarmed the whole of Lutheran Christendom. His death, in 1656, did not put an end to the controversial war, which continued to be waged with unabated fierceness against his son and the entire Faculty of the *University of Helmstaedt*.[2] The Wittenberg theologians were nearly successful in an attempt to force upon the Lutheran Church a new *Symbolical Book* (*Consensus repetitus ecclesiæ Lutheranæ*), in which, by way of antidote to the conciliatory views of Calixtus, the opinions of the most radical school of Lutheranism were invested with the dignity and authority of articles of faith. The attempt, however, was defeated by the stern resistance of the Jena theologians, of whom *Musaeus* was the most distinguished, and by the determined

[1] *Syncretism* is a term originally applied to an association of political parties, which had combined for the purpose of repelling external foes. The Cretes, we are informed by Plutarch in his work "*On Brotherly Love*," while themselves distracted by internal dissensions, formed such a union for repelling enemies from without, who were threatening them with a common danger. The word was still used by Zwingli and Melanchthon in a good sense; however, the latter was taunted with it as if it were synonymous with a *fusion of religious doctrines* and with hypocrisy and treason. Cf. *A. Menzel*, L. c., Vol. VIII., p. 125. *Herzog's* Cyclopæd., Vol. XV., pp. 342-372.

[2] *Henke*, The University of Helmstaedt during the Seventeenth (not sixteenth) Century, or *George Calixtus* and His Age, Halle, 1833 sq., 2 vols. *Gass*, George Calixtus and Syncretism, Breslau, 1846. *Schmid*, Hist. of the Syncretist Controversy in the Age of George Calixtus, Erlangen, 1846.

attitude of the Court of Dresden, which informed its promoters that such a measure could not be carried into effect without the consent of the prince.

8. *Triumph of the Lutheran doctrine.*—The Lutherans and Calvinists of Germany thus found themselves engaged in animated controversies, and separated from each other by feelings of hostile antagonism. Calvinism made few converts, except among the higher classes, and the opposition it met with among the lower orders effectually retarded its progress. Henceforth the fortunes of both systems were dependent on the ability and learning of their respective champions. Had Melanchthon's work, *Hypotyposes theologicæ*, continued in use, Calvinism would probably have come off victorious; and its defeat may be mainly ascribed to a series of dogmatical works, which shortly appeared from the pens of such men as *Martin Chemnitz*[1], *Gerhard*,[2] and *Leonard Hutter*,[3] who, enjoying the reputation of being the ablest theologians of their age, secured a complete triumph to Lutheranism by their masterly defence of its tenets. The power of Chemnitz's influence may be judged from the popular saying, "If Martin (Chemnitz) had not lived, the cause of Martin (Luther) would have perished" (*Si Martinus* (*Chemnitius*) *non fuisset, Martinus* (*Lutherus*) *non stetisset*). It is, however, a trifle amusing to see these men partially reviving in their works what they were pleased to call the *degenerate* scholastic method. The replies of the Calvinists were feeble and comparatively harmless.

B.—CONTROVERSIES AMONG THE REFORMED.

Walch, Historical and Theological Exposition of the Dissensions which have divided the Churches outside of Lutheranism, 3rd edition, Jena, 1733 sq., 5 vols. *Schweizer*, The Protestant Central Dogmas with the Reformed Church, Zürich, 1854 sq., 2 vols. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, pp. 404-420.

If the controversies that sprung up among the members of the Reformed Church were more easily and effectually controlled than those that had their origin among the Lutherans, the fact is to be mainly ascribed to *the practice of holding synods*, early introduced by Zwingli and Calvin. In Germany the cause of the Reformed Church was greatly strengthened by the declaration of the Elector Palatine, *Frederic III.*, in its favour (1559). At his request, the theologians *Ursinus* and *Olevianus* composed what is known as the "*Heidelberg Catechism*" (1563), which was recognized in Germany as a Symbolical Book, and, owing to the modification it introduced into

[1] Loci theol., ed. *Polyc. Leyser*, Frcf., 1591, 3 T., 4to, ed. V., Vit., 1690. He became still more renowned as a controversialist, in his most important work, "Examen Conc. Tridentini," occasioned by a discussion with the Jesuits, ed. *Preuss*, Berol., 1861 sq. *Lentz*, Chemnitz, being a biography, Gotha, 1866.

[2] Loci theol. cum pro adstruenda. tum pro destr. quorumvis contradicentium falsit., Jen., 1610-1625, 9 T., ed. *Cotta*, Tub., 1762-1781, 20 T., 4to, indices adjec. *Müller*, 1788 sq., 2 T., 4to; ed. II., 1767 sq., ed. *Preuss*, Berol., 1863 sq.

[3] *Leon. Hutteri* compendium locor. theol. jussu et auctor. *Christiani II.*, Vit., 1610. (*Hase*) Hutterus redivivus, 10th ed., Lps., 1862, lays down Hutter's Compendium as a foundation, and then shows the development of the dogma by Protestant theologians, particularly in the notes.

the gloomy system of Calvin, and the clear and popular style in which it was written, rose rapidly in public favour.[1] When Louis VI. (1576), after the death of Frederic, succeeded to the government, Calvinism yielded for a time before the advances of Lutheranism, but it again recovered its ascendancy when that prince had passed away (1583).

Some years later, *Maurice*, Landgrave *of Hesse* (1604) and *John Sigismund*, Elector of Brandenburg (1614), influenced more by an alliance with the Netherlands than by motives of conviction, also embraced the Calvinistic Reform. The Reformed teachings were triumphant in the Netherlands after the year 1609, when these provinces, by treaty, practically secured their political independence. But scarcely had the wounds of civil war been healed, when a religious war broke out, occasioned by the enmities existing between the advocates of the Zwinglian and Calvinistic systems. *Arminius*, a professor of Leyden, was commissioned to arbitrate between the *Supralapsarians* and the *Infralapsarians*. The former professed the extreme doctrine of Calvin and Beza, maintaining that God, by an eternal, absolute, and unconditional decree, had predestined some to be saved and others to be lost, even *before* the Fall had brought sin into the world, while the latter, adopting the teaching of Theodore Koornhert and the clergy of Delft, held that while God foresaw the Fall, the formal decree was not made until *after* Adam's transgression. Arminius rejected Calvin's dreadful doctrine of absolute election and reprobation, on the ground that it was incompatible with God's wisdom and goodness; whilst *Gomar*, who was associated with him in the commission, ardently defended it. The two became the leaders of opposing factions, known respectively as the *Arminian* and *Calvinistic Communities*, whose quarrels were seriously detrimental to the interests of the new Republic. On the death of Arminius, his cause was taken up by *Episcopius*, who, as the representative of his party, presented a statement of its doctrines, in the form of a *Remonstrance*, to the assembled States of Holland and West Friesland (1610). The teachings of the *Remonstrants* were ably defended by *Jan van Olden Barneveldt*, the celebrated advocate, and by the great humanist, *Hugo Grotius*, Syndic of Rotterdam,[2] the latter of whom succeeded in obtaining for them a statute of toleration in 1614.

But *Maurice, Prince of Orange*, Stadtholder of the Netherlands, and General of the Republic, ambitious of supreme power, and, conscious that the good-will of the Calvinists was essential to the success of his designs, sought to conciliate them by persecuting the Arminians. He accordingly had the venerable Barneveldt arraigned and put to death on the charge of holding Catholic doctrines and being in collusion with the Spaniards. He also condemned Hugo Grotius, together with other Arminians, to perpetual imprisonment; from

[1] See *Augusti*, Corpus libror. symbolicor., pp. 535-577.

[2] *Luden*, Hugo Grotius, according to history and his works, Berlin, 1805. *Louis Clarus* (Völk), Hugo Grotius' Return to the Catholic Faith, German transl. from the Dutch of *C. Broere*, ed. by *Schulte*, Treves, 1871.

which, however, the great jurist was fortunate enough to escape after the expiration of two years. As to the religious belief of Grotius, there has been at all times so great a discrepancy of opinion that the polymathist, *Ménage,* wrote the following epigram upon the subject :—

> "About the belief of Grotius quarrel Socinus,
> Luther and Calvin, Arminus, Rome and Arius."

The excitement continuing to increase rather than diminish, it was thought expedient to convoke another synod for the settlement of the controversy. For this purpose the famous *Synod of Dort,* at which were present representatives from the Reformed churches of every European country except France, convened, November 13, 1618, and continued its sittings until the end of April, 1619.[1] Concerning the ultimate decision there was hardly room for doubt ; because the Prince of Orange had been victorious over the Republican party, and the members, who were chiefly from the Netherlands, either openly professed Calvinism, or were secretly attached to its teachings. It was obvious, therefore, that the cause of the Arminians had been virtually disposed of *before the opening of the Synod.* To save appearances, however, in the Fifth Session the Remonstrants were cited to be present within fourteen days, and "freely state, explain, and defend" their *Five Articles,*[2] which embodied the questions under discussion. Headed by Simon Episcopius, they appeared on the 6th of December, and, after some preliminary work had been gone through, complained that the dominant party in the Synod, instead of conferring with them as equals, treated them as accused persons put on their defence. No notice was taken of their objection, and being commanded by the moderators to proceed to plead their cause, they again took exception to the order of procedure, insisting that the question of Reprobation, should come up first, while the Synod determined to begin with other cognate subjects, and also claimed the right of prescribing the manner in which the debate should be conducted. The Remonstrants refusing to yield, were dismissed, the prolocutor telling them that with a lie they came and with a lie they went away. In the Fifty-seventh Session four canons were framed, condemning the *Five Articles* of the Remonstrants, and, *in the name of the Holy Ghost,* setting forth the extreme doctrines of Calvinism as truths of faith which it is not lawful to controvert.

The substance of these canons may be summed up as follows :

[1] Acta Synodi nation. Dordr. hab. Lugd. Bat., 1620, fol.; Han., 1620, 4to. Acta et scripta synodal. Dordracena Remonstrantium, Harder., 1620, 4to. See also *Augusti,* Corpus libror. symbolicor., pp. 198-240. *Halesii,* Hist. conc. Dordraceni, ed. *Moshem.,* Hamb., 1824. Essay supplementary to the hist. of the Synod of Dort, Basle, 1825. *Heppe,* Historia synodi nation. Dordracenæ s. litteræ delegator. ad Landgrav. Mauricium. (*Illgen,* Hist. Review, 1853, p. 225 sq.) *Schweizer,* The Synod of Dort and its Apocrisis. (Journal of Hist. Theology, 1854, nro. 4).

[2] These were, respectively, On Election and Reprobation, On the Universality of the Death of Christ, On Free Will, On the Working of Divine Grace, and On the Perseverance of the Truly Faithful. (Tr.)

I. Faith is the free gift of God, which by his eternal decree He grants to those whom He has set apart from the beginning. The election has no dependence on any foreseen merit in those elected, and is wholly the result of his sovereign pleasure. While the non-elect, on account of their unbelief and other sins, are left to share the misery of the reprobates who are everlastingly lost, God is nevertheless not to be regarded as the author of their ruin.

II. By the death of Christ, expiation was made only for the sins of the elect, who alone reap the benefit of it.

III. Man's free-will is in no wise instrumental in the conversion of the elect. God is the sole author and finisher of all, granting faith and amendment of life to those whom He has set apart from the beginning.

IV. To the elect God grants complete exemption from the dominion of sin; and should they be guilty of grievous faults, still, by reason of the irreversible decree of election, they never become objects of his wrath, and are never entirely deprived of the assistance of his Holy Spirit.

It is a little amusing to see this theological Synod referring to the promise of Christ "to abide with his Church, even to the end of the world," when, according to the statements of all Protestants, He had given her over for above a thousand years to the most appalling errors. Episcopius and thirteen other ministers were banished the country, the Remonstrant assemblies suppressed, and two hundred preachers belonging to the party deposed. Forty of these passed over to the side of the Counter-Remonstrants, and others entered the Catholic Church. *Gerhard von Vossius*, *Gaspar Barlaeus*, and *Peter Bertius*, the most distinguished of the Leyden professors, were deprived of their chairs in the university. The English and Brandenburg Reformers refused to accept the decrees of the Synod.

After the death of Maurice of Orange (1625), the condition of the Remonstrants was somewhat improved, and in 1636 they were granted freedom of worship. Their opinions were ably defended by Episcopius in his numerous dogmatical treatises, known under the general name of Institutions of Theology (*Institutiones theologicæ*). It was not long, however, before they began to quarrel among themselves, and to split up into hostile factions, some adopting the Socinian views on the Trinity, original sin, grace, and satisfaction. The *Collegiants*,[1] a name derived from "colleges," the appellation which this eclectic sect gave to its communities, had their origin in the Calvinistic and

[1] *Rues*, The Present State of the Mennonites and Collegiants, Jena, 1743. *Fliedner*, A Begging Tour through Holland, Essen, 1831, Vol. I., p. 186 sq. The Collegiants admitted into their community all persons professing a belief in the inspiration of the Bible, and willing to accept it as a guide of life. They had no symbol or profession of faith, and permitted the widest diversity of opinion. Their only form of worship consisted of prayer-meetings, held Sundays and Wednesdays, and conducted by any of the members. They held Baptism by immersion to be necessary, and had "Sacramental meetings" of several days' duration twice a year, after the manner of the Scotch Presbyterians. See *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects and Heresies, art. "Collegiants." (Tr.)

Arminian controversies, and, after the close of the Synod of Dort, continued to hold *separate* meetings for worship. The enemies of all positive faith, they maintained that it was unlawful for a Christian either to take an oath, to hold public office, or wage war; and rejecting the priesthood and every other form of established ministry, they permitted anyone who felt inclined to preach and expound the Scriptures.

After the close of the Synod of Dort, the sect of the *Latitudinarians* took its rise in England. Averse to dogmas of any kind, they were especially hostile to rigid Calvinism, and in consequence adopted less gloomy and more lax theories on predestination. The most conspicuous champion of their teachings was *John Hales*, who had been one of the members of the Synod of Dort. Before him, however, *William Chillingworth* had greatly modified the austerity of the extreme Calvinistic views in his work entitled "*The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation*,"[1] which obtained a wide circulation. Calvinism underwent a similar modification in France. Its extreme rigorism was denounced by *Cameron* (†1625), whose scholar, *Amyraut*, a professor of divinity at Saumur, publicly undertook the defence of his master in a work entitled "*Universalismus hypotheticus*" (1634), where he maintained that God wishes the salvation of all men; that belief in Christ is essential to salvation; that God gives all the power to believe; and that if men are not saved they have no one to blame but themselves. He added, however, that besides this general and conditional decree, there was a special and unconditional one, in virtue of which God grants saving and irresistible faith *only to the elect*. His followers were called *Amyraldists*, or *Hypothetical Universalists*, and were numerous in France and Switzerland. Still later, *Le Blanc*, a professor of divinity at Sedan (†1675), took the ground similar to that taken by Calixtus on the part of the Lutherans, maintaining that the differences between the latter and the Calvinists were of minor importance, and affected no vital point, and hence that the two parties, without any sacrifice of principle, might unite and work in harmony.

§ 341. *Sects among the Protestants.*

Gieseler, Manual of Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., pp. 48-114. *Erbkam*, Hist. of Protestant Sects in the Age of the Reformation, Hamburg, 1848. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 336 sq. Cf. *Moehler*, Symbolism, Bk. II., p. 461 sq., 5th edit.

Of the *Anabaptists* of Thuringia, Wittenberg, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Westphalia, we have already spoken.[2] After their disastrous discomfiture at Münster, they divided into several branches. The most remarkable of them was the sect of *Baptists* called *Mennonites*,[3] deriving their name from *Menno Simonis*, an apostate Catholic

[1] The last edition of "*The Religion of Protestants, &c.*," by *Dr. Birch*, appeared in 1724.

[2] See §§ 308 and 317.

[3] *Hunzinger*, The Religion, Church, and Schools of the Mennonites, Spire, 1831. In

priest (†1561). His energy and activity were such that, in a comparatively short time, his teachings were propagated in Westphalia and the Netherlands, and had even spread as far as Livonia. Under his guidance, the fanaticism of the Anabaptists was changed into a constrained and decorous recollection. He gave to his followers a definite organization, forming them into a society of saints, after the manner of the early Christians. The Mennonites rejected infant baptism, forbade their members to institute proceedings in a civil court of judicature, declared it unlawful to take an oath or wage war, and refused to grant a bill of divorce except in cases of adultery. Even while Menno was still living his sect split into two parties on a point of discipline, some maintaining and others denying that such as fell into sin should be excommunicated, and never be again restored. The adherents of the two parties were known respectively as the "*Fine*," or strict Mennonites, composed chiefly of Flemings; and the "*Coarse*," or lax Mennonites, who were most numerous in the north of Holland, and were on this account sometimes called the Waterlanders. Another split was occasioned by difference of opinion on election and grace (predestination), some adopting the *Calvinistic* and others the *Arminian* theory.

The *Schwenkfeldians* were founded by *Gaspar Schwenkfeld*,[1] a native of Ossig, in Silesia. One of the earliest followers of Luther, he soon began to assail many points of his master's teaching, and to find fault with the whole system of the Reformation, in that, instead of fostering true piety and tending to cultivate interior life, it produced in its adherents only a dead faith, and the semblance without the reality of Christianity.[2] Luther's teaching on *Justification* and the *Lord's Supper* was the special object of his attack, and, with a view of bringing the great Reformer over to his way of thinking, undertook a journey, hoping by a personal interview to give greater force to his arguments. Failing in his mission, he returned, and, with the aid of *Valentine Krautwald*, a preacher of Liegnitz, continued to propagate his opinions. While his sincere piety softened the hearts of many, and won them to his cause, his earnestness and zeal excited the jealousy and inflamed the hatred of the Lutheran preachers against him. Though forced to consult for his safety by flight, he continued to maintain friendly relations with many Protestant

Holland they were also *Doopsgezinde*, or those who, excluding both immersion and aspersion, baptized by *pouring on* only. (Tr.)

[1] His writings and letters are in *Walch*, Biblioth. theolog., T. II., p. 67 sq. *A Brief Biography* of Schwenkfeld and his Departure from the Town of Ossig, 1697. Essential Doctrines of *Gaspar von Schwenkfeld* and his Co-religionists, Breslau, 1776. *Rosenberg*, Hist. of the Reformation of Silesia, p. 412. Cf. *A. Menzel*, New Hist. of the Germans, Vol. I., pp. 469-478. *Döllinger*, Hist. of the Reform, Vol. I., p. 226 sq.

[2] Cf. Warning against the Abuse of Several Capital Points of the Gospel, dated June 11, 1524, 4to. He considered as erroneous the following points: 1st. That faith alone justifies: 2nd. That man does not enjoy free-will; 3rd. That man is unable to keep the commandments of God; 4th. That man's works are without merit; 5th. That Christ has made satisfaction for mankind.

princes, and to keep up an active controversy with the theologians who opposed him, and by whom he was branded as an arch-heretic and Eutychian. By the year 1528 his opinions had become widely spread, notably in Alsace and Suabia. The most prominent feature of his teaching was the rejection of all external authority and established forms and the advocacy of interior life and sincere piety. No other theory of holy living, he said, is worthy of acceptance, and none other had any value in his eyes. The faith of the Lutherans, he went on to say, is something wholly external, is destitute of life and vivifying principle, ignores crosses and sufferings, shrinks from the mortification of the passions, and is too nearly allied to the world to give up its pleasures. *Justifying faith*, he continued, cannot remain inactive; it must carry on an unceasing conflict of good works against evil passions, and bring under subjection every form of concupiscence. Our Lord's words of Institution in the Eucharist he interpreted as follows: "My body is this"—a spiritual food which nourishes the *soul* as bread does the body; "My blood is this"—a spiritual drink which nourishes the *soul* as wine does the body.[1] He had also a novel theory *of the relation of the first to the second creation.* The first, he said, being imperfect, *was supplemented and perfected in the second through the renewal of all things in Christ.* This change was most conspicuously manifest in man. The image of God was only visible in faint outline in Adam; man was still but a creature of the earth earthly, and bore no adequate resemblance to the idea of manhood in the mind of God. But in the second birth, the natural Son, the Son of Mary, was raised to the rank of divine Sonship, being really the Son of God. This view was but a consequence of his conception of the *flesh of Christ.* According to Schwenkfeld, Christ is the Son of God, not only as to his divine, but also as to his *human* nature; and hence, instead of a hypostatic union, he held that there was *a unity of substance in Christ*, thus destroying the reality of his humanity.[2] As his life was far purer and more virtuous than those of his Lutheran adversaries, so were his writings more logical and dignified. He died at Ulm in 1561. There are still a few communities in the State of Pennsylvania, who revere the memory and emulate the virtues of Schwenkfeld.

Mention has already been made of some of the *adversaries of the Trinity.* Among the early Reformers, who rigorously adhered to the ancient symbols, such as opposed this dogma were punished with death.[3] *Campanus*, for denying the divinity of the Holy Ghost and holding Arian views concerning the Son, was cast into prison at Cleves, where he died about the year 1578. His followers fled to Poland, the common refuge of all heretical sectaries. For a time

[1] He explained the words of Consecration in the following manner: "Quod ipse panis fractus est corpori esurienti, nempe cibus, hoc est corpus meum, *cibus scilicet esurienti animarum.*"

[2] Cf. *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 711-714.

[3] See § 321.

they remained in retirement, under the generic appellation of *Dissidents*, but about the year 1563 they formed a separate organization, under the name of *Unitarians*, and, by the active assistance of the Polish noblemen, made Rakow their headquarters. Through the influence of *Blandrata*, a native of Piedmont and physician to the prince, they received public recognition in Transylvania. Christ they held to be only a man, but a man richly endowed by God; and to make Him an object of worship they denounced as an idolatrous act. This rationalistic tendency, *so strangely in contrast with the low estimate put upon reason by all the early Reformers*, was still more marked in the teaching of the two *Socinuses*.

Laelius Socinus,[1] a member of a noble family of Siena, unlike most of the Reformers, was a man of austere manners and retiring disposition, though not distinguished for eminent ability or profound thought. Educated among the Antitrinitarians of Italy, he early became a member of a debating club, formed at Vicenza, and composed of forty persons of tastes and beliefs akin to his own. After the breaking up of this club, which was really a propagandism of Antitrinitarian views, under the guise of a literary society, Laelius made a tour through France, England, Holland, Germany, and Poland, in the course of which he fell in with many transalpine Reformers. He finally settled down in Zürich, where he died in 1562, when only thirty-seven years of age. Laelius had made his nephew, *Faustus Socinus* (†1604), his literary heir, and the latter, taking the writings of his uncle as a basis, drew out and threw into shape the doctrine of Unitarianism, thus giving to the *Unitarians* of Poland, where he resided (after 1579), a definite creed and a distinct religious organization. From this time forth they took the name of *Socinians*.[2] The most eminent of their theological writers were *Lublinitzki*, *Moskorzowski*, *Wissowatzi*, *Przypkowski*, *Gasper Schlichting*, and *John Louis Wolzoyen*.[3] Their doctrine, while professing to be purely biblical, was essentially rationalistic; and the few faint traces of the supernatural, which it at first contained, grew gradually dimmer, till in the sequel they wholly disappeared. It is fully set forth in the *Catechism of Rakow*, and may be briefly stated in the following propositions. The idea of a God, of things divine, and of the distinction between good and evil, comes to man through education and other *external* sources. Man's *likeness to God* consists in this, that he has dominion over the lower animals. One might naturally be led to infer that, starting with these principles, they would bow in humble submission to all the facts attested by the witnesses of Holy Writ; while, on the contrary, they frankly avowed that whatever is contrary to reason (meaning, of course,

[1] *Trechsel*, Protestant Antitrinitarians before Faustus Socinus, Heidelberg, 1844, 2 vols. Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclop., s. v. Socin.

[2] *Sam. Fred. Lauterbach*, Ariano-Socianismus olim in Polonia, or Origin and Extent of Arian Socinianism in Poland, Frcf. and Lps., 1725.

[3] *Bibliotheca* fratrum Polon,, Irenop (Amst.), 1658, 8 T., fol., Catech. Racov. (1609), ed. *Oeder*, Frcf., 1739. Cf. *Wissowatzius*, Religio rationalis, 1685, Amst., 1703.

the reason of the Socinians) could not be accepted as revealed doctrine. *Inspiration*, properly so called, or that influence under which the words of Scripture were written, they held, conformably with their idea of the Holy Ghost, to be no more than an intelligent understanding, possessed by virtuous and upright men, such as those who composed the Holy Books, under the guidance of God, who guarded them against the introduction of errors in matters of grave importance They held the *Father* of Jesus Christ to be *alone God.* Christ is a mere man, though begotten in a supernatural way by divine power. In consequence of this miraculous conception, He is called the Son of God. Before beginning his public ministry, Christ went up into heaven, and received directly from the Father the Gospel, which He was commissioned to announce to mankind in the Father's name. As a reward for his obedience, He received, after his second ascension, dominion over the universe, and on this account must be honoured as *God-man*, with the same honour that is paid to God Himself. The work of the redemption of mankind He continues in heaven by offering Himself up for them to his Father. Their reconciliation, however, is not effected by vicarious satisfaction, but by remission of sins. The *Holy Ghost*, they said, is not a Divine Person, but an energy or power of the Godhead.

According to the Socinian *anthropology*, Adam was indeed by his nature liable to death; yet had he persevered in obedience *he would not have died.* Original sin is the invention of theologians, by whom it was subsequently introduced into the Christian scheme. The effects of Adam's fall did not go beyond his own person, except in so far as it entailed the necessity of death upon his descendants. Man endeavours, by the aid of his natural powers, to live morally; these powers are then supplemented and perfected by Christ, whose life, inasmuch as it exemplifies the fruits of virtue, excites in man a desire of holy living. *Justification* is a judgment of God, who graciously absolves from sin and releases from punishment those who by faith in Christ diligently observe the moral law. The *interior workings of grace* being thus discarded, they consistently held the *Sacraments* to be but external ceremonies. Baptism is no more than a form of initiation into the Christian community, and the Lord's Supper only an enduring commemoration of Christ's death. The long season of peace enjoyed by the Socinians was turned to good account by them in propagating their rationalistic system. They were at length vigorously opposed by the Jesuits, driven out of Rakow in 1638, and expelled from all Poland in 1658.

Observation. Now that the origin and leading characteristics of Protestantism are known, the questions may be asked: What is its true *value?* What are the *results* it has produced? After what has been said, the reader will be tolerably capable of giving answers to these two questions. He will, however, find the subject more fully treated and viewed under different aspects in the works of *Robelot* and *Kerz.*[1] It is also handled very

[1] *Robelot*, De l'influence de la réform. de Luther sur la croyance religieuse, 1822 (against Villers), German by Raess and Weiss, Mentz, 1823. (*Kerz*). The Spirit and Consequences of the Reformation, being a refutation of Villers, Mentz, 1823.

exhaustively by *Döllinger*, who supports his statements by the avowals of Protestants themselves. The same subject has been taken up by *Perrone*, *Balmes*, and *Nicolas*, and by other writers, like *Villers*,[1] *Hagenbach*, *Schenkel*, and *Hundeshagen*, who have given their especial attention to Protestantism.[2] The points to be kept steadily in view in prosecuting this inquiry are: First, the relations of the new doctrines to many of the ancient heresies; and, second, their relations to the *Catholic Church*. Considered from the latter point of view, Protestantism may not only be regarded as a *heresy*, but as "*a framework into which all heresies may be fitted.*" Judged *politically*, Protestantism was the basis of the Religious Peace of Westphalia, by which it obtained *equal rights* with the Catholic Church; whereas previously to the sixteenth century, heresy was held to be a political crime, punishable with death. It was with difficulty the *Popes* reconciled themselves to the changed condition of heretics. *Innocent X.* protested against the articles of the Peace of Westphalia, complaining that Protestants "had nearly everywhere been permitted the free exercise of their religion; that building-sites had been granted them for churches; and that, like Catholics, they had been declared eligible to public offices and trusts," whereas truth should have authority over error.

Stanislaus Hosius, Bishop of Ermeland, and Cardinal of the Roman Church, an able controversialist and a close and judicious observer of the event of his age, concisely sums up the *successive stages through which Protestantism*[3] *passes* from its first beginnings to its last results. "The reformatory zeal," he says, "of the enemies of the Church is, as a rule, first directed against what they call human ordinances, meaning feasts and fasts, the celibacy of the clergy, monastic vows, and the like, by which, they pretend, she has been disfigured. They next demand the Chalice for the laity, and, when it is refused, proclaim that the Church and the Pope teach what is contrary to Holy Writ, since it is said, '*Drink ye all of this.*' They then take matters into their own hands, and, rejecting transubstantiation and the abiding Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, substitute for the one a *transient* Presence at the moment of reception, and for the other the theory of impanation. These doctrines once established, the Sacrifice and the Priesthood cease to have any meaning. Having gone so far in their apostasy, they feel no difficulty in advancing step by step till they push their assumption to their last results, and end by blasphemously *denying* the mystery of *the Blessed Trinity* and the *Divinity of Christ*. Hence," he concludes, "men pay a poor compliment to their reason and judgment when, professing to be startled at the doctrines of the Antitrinitarians, they can see nothing to find fault with in the principles of their forerunners, particularly the Calvinists. Either," he goes on to say, "get rid of all sects at once, or *tolerate them all equally*, that while one is being persecuted the others may not be strengthened and encouraged." The same writer, in exhorting the Poles to continue steadfast and loyal to the One Church, calls their attention to the dissensions and calamities which the Reformation was instrumental in bringing upon Germany, England, and France.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

§ 342. *Summary.*

THE Catholic Church had been seriously threatened. It became now a matter of grave concern to heal the wounds she had received, and to ward off the blows directed against her by her enemies. The faith had been assailed and subjected to no end of misrepresentations. Whole nations had lapsed into error.

[1] *Villers*, Essai sur l'esprit et l'influence de la réformation de Luther, Paris, 1802, German by *Cramer* and *Henke*, Hamburg, 1828.

[2] See p. 392.

[3] Judicium et censura de judicio et censura Heidelbergensium Tigurinorumque ministrorum in *Hosii*, Opp., T. I., pp. 669-707.

It was, first of all, necessary to define precisely *dogmas* that had been misrepresented and corrupted. Next, it was necessary to correct *abuses*, that were manifestly such, and to re-establish order on a new basis. All this was done; and the more imminent were the dangers by which the Church was threatened, the more visible were the manifestations of her power, and the more unquestionable the evidences of her greatness. According to ancient usage, she set the seal of authority upon her faith by the voice of *an œcumenical council.* It was subsequently developed and defended by *the splendid scientific labours of men* as learned as they were profound. Externally, the marvellous activity of the *Jesuits* produced the most gratifying results. Internally, *the older and the younger Religious Orders* rivalled each other in reviving spiritual life, and both put forth fresh energies in defence of the Old Church. Her losses from those who had lapsed into Protestantism were more than made up by the number of those brought into her fold in other parts of the world through the *heroic labours of her missionaries.* "The conquests of the Romish Church in the New World," says *Macaulay*, "more than compensated for its loss in the Old."

Such is a meagre outline of the facts to be treated in this chapter, which covers one of the most momentous periods in the history of the Catholic Church.

§ 343. *The Œcumenical Council of Trent.*

Sarpi (P. Suave Pol.), Istoria del Conc. di Trento, Lond., 1619; translated into French, with historico-dogmatic notes, by *Courayer;* into German by *Winterer*, Mergentheim, 1840 sq., 4 vols. This Servite monk and theologian of the Republic of Venice, wrote full of bad humour and in satirist fashion against the hierarchy, showing rather a tendency to Protestant principles. He was in part contradicted by the Jesuit *Pallavicini*, who afterwards became cardinal, and far surpassed Sarpi in aptness of representation, Ist. del Concil. di Trento, Rom., 1652, 3 T., fol., illustrata con annotazioni da *Fr. Ant. Zaccaria*, Rome, 1833, 4 vols., 4 latt. redd. *Giottino*, Ant., 1673, 3 T., fol.; transl. in part by *Klitshe*, Augsb., 1835 sq., 3 vols. Cf. †*Brischar*, Criticism on the (historic and dogmatical) Controversies of *Sarpi* and *Pallavicini* in the History of the Council of Trent, Tüb., 1843 sq., 2 parts. (*Le Plat*), Monuments pour servir à l'histoire du Conc. de Trente, 1781, 6 T., latin., Lovan., 1781 sq., 7 T., 4to. The protocols written by the secretary-general, *Masarelli*, giving the complete acts of this Council, and the printing of which was commenced in Rome by *Aug. Theiner*, appeared after the latter's death; Acta genuina SS. œcum. conc. Trid., etc., Zagrabiæ (Agram), 1874, 2 T., 4to. The editing, however, has been done, in many instances, with little care, so that completeness and fidelity are questionable. *Th. Sickel* published "Documents in Austrian Archives, illustrating the Hist. of the Council of Trent," Vienna, 1871-1872, three divisions. Hereupon *Döllinger* published "Unprinted Documents, Diaries, touching the Hist. of the Council of Trent," Nördlingen, 1876, 2 vols. *Salig*, Complete History of the Council of Trent, Halle, 1741 sq., 3 vols., 4to. †*Goeshl*, Hist. Review of the Counc. of Trent, Ratisbon, 1840. *Wessenberg*, The Great Councils, Vols. 3 and 4; also "*The Catholic*," 1841, May and December nros. †*Rütjes*, Hist. of the Counc. of Trent, Münster, 1846. †*Werner*, Hist. of Polemic and Apologetic Lit., Vol. IV., pp. 386-579. Canones et decreta conc. Trid., 1567, 4to; ed. *Jod. le Plat*, Lov., 1779, 4to. *Gallemart*, in several editions, with references to cognate church ordinances of earlier times; ed. stereotypa, Lps., 1842: latine et germanice, ed. *Smets*, Bielefeld, 1847; *edd. *Richter* et *Schulte*, cum declarat. conc. Trid. interpretum et resolution. thesauri sacr. congr. Conc., Lps., 1853. Cf. *Philipps'* Can. Law, Vol. IV., p. 463 sq.

At the opening of the sixteenth century the necessity of holding a council was deeply felt, and princes and nations were earnest in their

appeals for its convocation. Abuses the most flagrant had crept into the Church, and the new teachings of the Reformers aggravated instead of correcting them. The very existence of the Church seemed threatened. Still the Popes hesitated. They called to mind the scenes at Basle, and did not care to see them re-enacted. The conditions were not favourable. All Christendom was more or less diseased, and it seemed impossible, amid the excitement of the age, to furnish an adequate remedy. The means were wanting; there had been no adequate preparation for prompt and decisive action; and the dispositions of ecclesiastical bodies were not satisfactory. There were also external obstacles in the way, such as the wars between Charles V. and Francis I. during the pontificate of *Clement VII.* This Pope, however, carrying out the design of his predecessor, *Hadrian VI.*, entered actively upon the work of reform. He desired to effect a reformation first in the Roman clergy, and in the course of time to extend it to the clergy of the whole Church; and for this purpose he established a Congregation, placing at its head the distinguished Bishops of Verona and Carpentras, *Giberto* and *Sadolet.*[1] These delays had their advantages. They gave time for excitement to abate and passions to cool. To Protestants they gave a sufficient interval in which to reduce their teachings to a precise and compendious form, and, consequently, to Catholics a better opportunity to refute them.

Paul III. (1534-1549), the successor to Clement, was a member of the Farnese family, and an accomplished humanist. He at once set seriously to work to convoke a council.[2] That he was in earnest is proved by the fact that from the very beginning of his reign he raised no one to the dignity of the cardinalate who was not eminent for piety and learning. To such men he committed the work of reform in the Church, and the task of framing a bull for the convocation of a council (May, 1537). Never, perhaps, was any ruler more accurately informed of the wants of his kingdom, or more frankly told of the shortcomings of his government.[3] He convoked the Council to meet at Mantua, and commanded the bishops of the Universal Church to attend in person, under pain of suspension. Plenipotentiaries would not be recognized.[4] The Protestants were also invited to be present, but declined.

It was then transferred to *Vicenza*, but with no better results. It was finally opened at *Trent*, December 3, 1545, by the Pope's Legates, *Del Monte*, *Cervino*, and *Pole*.[5] There were present four archbishops, twenty bishops, five generals of religious orders, Pighini,

[1] †**Kerker*, Church Reforms immediately before the Council of Trent (Tub. Quart. 1859, pp. 3-56).

[2] *Raynald*, Ad. an. 1534, nro. 2, and *Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. III, c. 17, nro. 3.

[3] Cf. *Kerker*, L. c., pp. 39-42.

[4] Only the *German* bishops afterwards received a secret dispensation, "lest they might leave their flocks in the midst of wolves."

[5] Cardinal *Manning*, in the March number of the "*Nineteenth Century*" (1877),

the auditor of the Roman Rota, the deputies of the emperor, and those of Ferdinand, King of the Romans. The heart of the Pontiff was gladdened when his Legate, Cardinal Pole, wrote to him from Trent: "The doors of the Council are flung open; the reproach of barrenness is removed from the Church, as of old from Rachael. We pray that abundant measures of divine grace may be poured down upon us, and that we may be able with the same prophet to invite all to come and be satiated at her breasts." The Protestants had expressed a preference that the Council should be held in a German city, and now that their wish had been complied with, they persistently refused to attend. While the Council was in session, they also received three distinct invitations to be present, all of which they declined.[1]

On account of the small number of bishops present, the time was at first occupied in making the necessary preparations for holding "*The Holy Œcumenical Council.*" The work to be done by it was indicated. It embraced "*the propagation of the faith; the elevation of the Christian religion; the uprooting of heresies; the restoration of peace; the reformation of the clergy and Christian people; and the overthrow of the enemies of the Christian name.*"

Following the precedents of earlier councils, the Fathers decided that *congregations* composed of theologians and canonists should prepare *in advance* the subjects to which the Council proposed to give its attention. These were then submitted to *a General Congregation* of bishops, *once or oftener*, as the case required. This Congregation framed, discussed, and voted upon the decrees, which, when adopted, were announced in *public session* as the result of their deliberations. The voting was done, not by nations, as at Constance, but by the individual voices of those actually present, according to the usage of more ancient councils. The generals of religious orders were each entitled to a vote, while only one was allowed to every three abbots. There was at first a *difference* of opinion as to whether doctrine or

gives the following summary of the fortunes of the Council of Trent. The Council of Trent "was convoked in 1536, to meet at Mantua in May of the following year. It was then, by reason of opposition, prorogued till November, 1537. Then it was deferred till May, 1538, to meet at Vicenza. So few bishops came, by reason of war and of the disturbed state of Europe and of Italy, that the Pope, weary of proroguing, suspended the Council indefinitely. The Turks were still victorious, and Germany was every day losing its faith. Paul III, therefore, without the assent of princes, convoked the Council to meet in November, 1542, in the city of Trent. Three legates went to Trent, and waited many months for the bishops, who were still unable to attend, by reason of war and the dangers of travel. The Council was again suspended till a more favourable time. After three years, it was again fixed for March, 1545. After this came another delay; and the Council opened in April following. After fifteen months it was transferred to Bologna, where the bishops were so few that no decree was made; and, after five months, it was again indefinitely prorogued. It was then suspended for four years. Under Julius III., it began once more in Trent in May, 1551. It sat for a year; then, in April, 1552, it was suspended for two years, but the tumults of the world were such that it remained suspended for ten. In January, 1562, it was opened again. In December, 1563, the First Legate dismissed the bishops to their homes; and in January, 1564, Pius IV., by the bull *Benedictus Deus*, confirmed the work of the Council of Trent." (Tr.)

[1] See p. 269 sq.

discipline should have precedence in the deliberations of the Council. Some said *that a better impression would be made upon heretics, if they saw both the clergy and the laity of the Catholic Church faithfully fulfilling the law of Christ;* while others contended *that unless the truths of religion were first established, the lives of Catholics would be open to censure, inasmuch as their doctrines were claimed to be either false or corrupted.* After an animated discussion, a middle course was wisely adopted,[1] and at most of the Sessions two decrees were published, one on doctrine and another on *discipline* (*de reformatione*). The decrees on *doctrine* are first stated at length in the form of *chapters*, and then, more briefly, in the form of *canons*. The specific work for which the Council had assembled was not reached until the *Fourth Session*, held April 8, 1546. In view of the arbitrary way in which Protestants had dealt with the Scriptures, accepting some portions of them and rejecting others, the Fathers of this Session drew up and decided upon the *Canon of the Bible*, in the drafting of which they conformed to those of the Councils of Hippo (393), Carthage (397), and Trullo (680). Of all the Latin *versions* then in use, they declared the *Vulgate* to be the *authentic* one; or, in other words, that, in whatever relates to faith and morals, it is in substantial agreement with the original text. They further showed *the relation of Holy Scripture to the teachings of the Church*, and *explained the rule of interpretation.* In putting an interpretation upon Holy Scripture, that one is to be chosen which is most in accord with the principles handed down in the Church from age to age.[2] Some regulations were also made concerning the editions of the Holy Bible.

In the *Fifth Session*, in which many points of the Church's doctrine on *original sin* came up for discussion, it was decreed that Adam, by his fall, *had deteriorated in both soul and body;* that the effects of his fall had been transmitted by *propagation* to all his descendants; that these effects are wholly removed by the merits of Jesus Christ and *his grace in the Sacrament of Baptism;* that the *concupiscence*, which still lingers in man, *is not in itself sinful;* that this decree has

[1] Owing to remonstrances, on the part of those in authority, for which it seems difficult to find any adequate justification, the *routine* of the Council was not allowed to be made public until recently; and, when at last an account of it did appear, it was greatly disfigured by the malevolent misrepresentations and ignorance of hostile parties. *Friedrich*, Ordo et modus in celebratione sacri et œcumenici concilii Tridentini observatus. An extract from the Codex latinus 813 of the Royal Public Library of Munich, as compared with the routine of the *Vatican* Council, 1869-1870, in his Documenta ad illust. Concilium Vatic., Section I., Noerdling., 1871. Later: *Routine of the Counc. of Trent*, from a MS. of the Vatican archives, edited completely for the first time; Latin ed., Vienna, 1871; German edition, with a parallel drawn between the Counc. of Trent and that of the Vatican, 1871.

[2] Agreeing in substance with *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, who flourished towards the end of the second century, and using almost the precise words of *Vincent of Lerins* in the fifth century (see Vol. I., pp. 285, 411), the Council of Trent ordained: "Ut nemo suæ prudentiæ innixus, *in rebus fidei et morum*—sacram scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione scripturarum sacrarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum ipsam sacram scripturam interpretari audeat." Cf. *Alzog*, Explicatio Catholicor. systematis de interpretat. litterarum sacr., Monaster., 1835. *Friedlieb*, Scripture, Tradition, and Church Exegesis, Bresl., 1854.

no reference to the Blessed Virgin; and that the decrees of Sixtus IV. relating to her are in nowise impaired. The *decree on reformation* had reference to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, to the encouragement of the liberal arts, and to the preaching of the Gospel. It was ordained that all archbishops, bishops, and other prelates should preach, either in person or by substitute; from which it is evident that the Council was not only fully aware of the source of the growing evils, but fearlessly struck at their very root.

The *Sixth Session*, held January 13, 1547, issued a decree on *justification*,[1] which is a perfect model of doctrinal exposition, discards heretical errors, and is remarkable for the luminous precision of its language.

The *decrees on reformation* enforce the duty of episcopal residence and the visitation of churches.

The decrees of the *Seventh Session*, by logical sequence, pass on to the consideration of the doctrine of the *Sacraments* in general,[2] and of *Baptism* and *Confirmation* in particular.

The *decree on reformation* forbids the holding of incompatible benefices, and ordains that they cannot be legally taken possession of until after the candidates have proved their fitness by a rigid examination, except in instances in which the appointments have been made by universities.

[1] Against *Luther's* doctrine on justification (see § 340), "justificatio" is defined as the "translatio ab eo statu, in quo homo nascitur filius primi Adæ, in statum gratiæ et adoptionis filiorum Dei per secundum Adam Jesum Christum, salvatorem nostrum." More explicitly it is then described as non solum (abolitio) remissio peccatorum, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ et donorum (1 Corinth. vi. 11; Tit. iii. 5-7). The relation of *faith* to justification is determined thus: "Fides et humanæ salutis *initium, fundamentum et radix omnis justificationis*, sine qua impossibile est placere Deo et ad filiorum ejus consortium venire" (Sess. VI., cap. 8), which is directly against *Luther*, who maintained that faith is the "fastigium omnis justificationis."

The doctrine of *imputative* justice, invented by Luther, and perfected by Calvin, is rejected by the Council thus: "Si quis magnum illud usque in finem perseverantiæ donum se certo habiturum, absoluta et infallibili certitudine dixerit, *nisi hoc ex speciali revelatione* didicerit, anathemata sit." Sess. VI., can. 16. Cf. Caput 12. The views of Luther on the *liberty* of man, which are so many developments of his doctrine on justification, are condemned thus: "Si quis liberum hominis arbitrium post Adæ peccatum amissum et extinctum esse dixerit; aut rem esse de solo titulo, immo titulum sine re, figmentum denique a satana invectum in ecclesiam: anathema sit" (Sess. VI., can. 5). Luther's theory of the total helplessness and perverseness of paganism was emphatically discarded in these words: "Si quis dixerit, opera omnia, *quæ ante justificationem fiunt*, quacumque ratione facta sint, *vere esse peccata*, vel odium Dei mereri: aut quanto vehementius quis nititur se disponere ad gratium, tanto eum gravius peccare: anathema sit." Agreeably to this canon, the regula VII. of the regulæ decem de libris prohibitis against Luther and others, favoured the heathen classics, stating: "Antiqui vero ab ethnicis conscripti libri propter sermonis elegantiam et proprietatem permittuntur; nulla tamen ratione *pueris* prælegendi sunt." The last words, according to the context, refer to "libri, qui res lascivas seu obscœnas ex professo tractant, narrant aut docent, etc."

[2] "Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta; aut esse plura vel pauciora quam *septem*, videlicet baptismum., confirmationem, etc., aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum: anathema sit.—Si quis dixerit, ea ipsa nova legis sacramenta a sacramentis antiquæ legis non differre, nisi quia ceremoniæ sunt aliæ, et alii ritus externi: anathema sit." (Sess. VII., can. 1 and 2.)

The Council had thus far done its work in peace, but unfortunately at this stage of its proceedings its progress was interrupted by the unfriendly relations of the Pope and the Emperor Charles V. By the victory of Muehlberg, the emperor had dissolved the League of Smalkald. Fearing that Charles would now employ his newly-strengthened authority against the Church, and desiring to have the Council at a more convenient distance from Rome, he transferred it from Trent to *Bologna*. There was also another reason for the transference. Trent was menaced with a terrible pestilence, the presence of which, according to the testimony of physicians, was already indicated by unmistakable signs.

In the *Eighth Session* (March 11, 1547), a majority of the bishops expressed themselves in favour of the change, and at once set out for Bologna. Here the continuation of the work of the Council was prevented by the opposition of the emperor and the bishops in his interest, and, after two unimportant Sessions, the Pope ordered Cardinal *Del Monte* to dismiss the Fathers. Before they could be again called together, Paul III. died.[1] The abilities and other admirable qualities of the Pope were marred by his unseemly nepotism.

His successor, *Julius III.* (Del Monte, 1550-1555), had taken an oath in Conclave to immediately convoke the Council, and as the emperor seemed favourable to the project, its sessions were again opened at Trent in May, 1551.

On account of a quarrel existing between the Pope and *Henry II.*, King of France, concerning the Duchy of Parma, the latter forbade the French bishops to go to Trent. Nevertheless, the business of the Council went on.

The *Eleventh* and *Twelfeth Sessions* (May 1 and September 1, 1551), were merely preparatory to succeeding ones; and in the *Thirteenth Session* (October 11th), the all-important question of the *Eucharist* was taken up. It was defined that, after the act of consecration, Christ is *really, truly,* and *substantially* present in the Sacrament of the Altar, under the forms of bread and wine, in his Divinity and in his Humanity; that He is received in Holy Communion, not only *spiritually,* but *sacramentally* and *really;* and that He is to be set up in the remonstrance for the adoration of the people.[2] The Fathers gave no attention at all to the quarrel between the Franciscans and Dominicans as to the mode of Christ's Presence, whether It is by *production* or *adduction.*[3]

The *decree on reformation* speaks of canonical correction and the

[1] *Quirini,* Imago opt. Pontif. expressa in gestis Paul III., Brix., 1745.

[2] Sess. XIII., can. 1: "Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimæ eucharistiæ sacramento contineri *vere, realiter* et *substantialiter* Corpus et Sanguinem, *una cum anima et divinitate* Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde *totum* Christum; sed dixerit tantummodo esse in eo, ut in *signo* vel figura, aut *virtute:* anathema sit." It is easily seen that the marked term *vere* is directed against the Eucharistic doctrine of *Zwinglius, realiter* against *Luther* and *Calvin,* who denied the *objective* reality of Christ's presence, and *substantialiter* against Calvin.

[3] See Vol. II., p. 561, note 1.

reformation of the clergy. The rights of bishops were also defined, and it was determined that no appeal should be taken from an episcopal to a higher tribunal before the final decision of the former had been given. A form of a *safe-conduct* was also drawn up for the use of such Protestants as wished to visit the Council; but it was declined by them as unsatisfactory. In the *Fourteenth Session* the doctrine of the Sacraments of *Penance*[1] and *Extreme Unction*[2] was defined. The *decree on reformation* speaks of the manner of life becoming the clergy, the conferring of Holy Orders, the jurisdiction of bishops, and other subjects of a cognate nature.

In the *Fifteenth Session* (January 25, 1552), the Fathers prolonging the proceedings out of consideration for many Protestant States and princes, who had signified their intention to send theologians to the Council,[3] drew up another safe-conduct, more explicit in form than the preceding one; but this also was declined as unsatisfactory. It was objected by the Protestants that it did not grant their theologians the right to vote; that it barred any discussion of questions already settled; that it did not recognize the Bible as the only source of faith; that it held the Pope to be above the Council, and not subject to its rulings; and that it contained a refusal to release the bishops from their oaths of obedience.

After many ineffectual efforts had been made to bring about an understanding, the perfidious conduct of Maurice of Saxony, who, betraying the emperor, hastily occupied the defiles of the Tyrol, necessitated the suspension of the Council in its *Sixteenth Session*. Before breaking up, the Fathers mutually agreed to assemble again at the expiration of two years. Nine years, however, went by before the Council again assembled, and in the meantime the Religious Peace of Augsburg had been concluded (1555). While these events were transpiring, Julius III. and his worthy successor, *Marcellus II.*, whose elevation to the Chair of St. Peter was hailed as the return of the golden age of the Church,[4] went to their reward. The next successor to the Papacy was *Paul IV.* (Caraffa, 1555-1559), probably the least courtly and accomplished of the cardinals. He found himself at once engaged in a dispute with the emperor concerning the

[1] "Si quis dixerit, in catholica ecclesia *pœnitentiam non esse vere et proprie sacrametum* pro fidelibus, quoties post Baptismum in peccata labuntur, ipsi Deo reconciliandis a Christo Dom nostro institutum: anathema sit." (Sess. XIV. de pœnit., can. 1. Cf. cap. 1 and 2).

[2] "Si quis dixerit, *Extremam Unctionem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum* a Christo Dom. nost. *institutum* et insinuatum (Marc. vi. 13) et a beato Jacobo Apostolo *promulgatum* et fidelibus commendatum (Jacob. v. 14, 15), sed ritum tantum acceptum a Patribus, aut figmentum humanum: anathema sit." (Sess. XIV. de sacram. extremæ unct., can. 1. Cf. cap. I.)

[3] Cf. the work written before this time: *Alberti Pighii*, Apologia indicti a Paulo III., Rom. Pontifice concilii adv. Lutheranæ confœderationis rationes plerasque, Colon., 1538.

[4] *P. Polidori*, De vita Marcelli II. commentar., Rom., 1744, 4to. The words of Cato were often applied to Marcellus (Cervini): "O te felicem, a quo nemo audet quidquam inhonestum petere!" He was, besides, a very learned man. Only *Sarpi* attempts to make him an astrologer, but is ably refuted by *Pallavicini*.

kingdom of Naples.[1] He had also the mortification to see his authority disregarded in the matter of the abdication of Charles V., and the elevation of his brother, *Ferdinand*, to the Imperial throne, and from that day to this the crowning of an emperor at Rome has not so much as been thought of. The *Duke of Alva* appeared before the walls of Rome, and threatened the city with the same disasters that had come upon it in the year 1527.

In the early days of his reign the conduct of the Pope had been open to the charge of nepotism; and when, later on, he changed his policy, and proceeded with considerable severity against laxity in morals, the designs of his relatives, and the insubordination of the subjects of the States of the Church, the people rose in rebellion against him. By the bull "*Cum ex apostolatus officio*" he made an ineffectual attempt to restore the Papal prerogatives of the Middle Ages.

Pius IV. (1559-1565) confirmed the title of *Ferdinand I. to the Imperial Crown*, and on the 29th of November, 1560,[2] again convoked the Council. On the previous 3rd of June he had declared in the College of Cardinals his wish to have the Council meet, in the following words: "We desire the assembling of the Council. Did we not desire it, we should be left to struggle on against difficulties, which it is our wish to remove. The Council shall reform whatever there is to be reformed, even if it be *our own* person and *our own* affairs. If we have any other thought than to serve God, may his punishment come upon us." The Council was again opened at Trent; although the Protestants, without any sufficient reason, had demanded that it should convene in some city nearer Germany. The Papal Legate, *Hercules Gonzaga*, who was appointed to preside, came attended by a number of cardinals, of whom *Stanislaus Hosius*, Bishop of Ermeland, was the most distinguished. At the opening of the *Seventeenth Session* one hundred and twelve Fathers were present. *This and all the other Sessions to the Twentieth*, inclusive, were engaged in *preparatory work*. In the *Eighteenth Session* a third safe-conduct was drawn up, containing concessions the most ample, and addressed, not only to the Germans, but to the deputies of the other nations. All were called upon by the tender mercies of God to help in bringing about harmony and reconciliation; to practise charity, which is the bond of perfection; and to bear within their breasts the peace of Christ, which gladdens the heart.

In the *Twenty-first Session* a decree was published on Communion under both kinds and on the Communion of little children. On the first point the Council reaffirmed the decisions of Basle, stating that Communion under one kind is sufficient, but that as time goes on and

[1] *A. Carraccioli*, Collect. hist. de vita Pauli IV., Col., 1612, 4to. *F. Magii*, Disquis. de Paul. IV. inculpata vita, Neap., 1672, fol. *Bromata*, Storia di Paolo IV., Rom., 1748, 2 T., 4to. *Reumont*, Hist. of Rome, Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 513, sq.

[2] Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, translated by *J. Waterworth*, p. 131, N. Y. and Lond., 1848. (Tr.)

circumstances require, the Church may introduce changes in the administration of the Sacraments, without affecting their substance. On the second point it was declared that Communion was not necessary to the salvation of little children. The *decree on reformation* speaks more or less in detail of the various duties of episcopal administration.

In the *Twenty-second Session*, which treats of the *Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, the Eucharist is declared to be "*verum, proprium, et propitiatorium, sacrificium.*" The sublimity which characterizes the decisions relating to the Eucharist is in admirable harmony with the surpassing grandeur of the subject. The Council expresses a wish that all persons present would receive Holy Communion at the daily Masses, and also approves of the celebration of private Masses. The decision of the question on the *use of the Cup by the laity*, after a prolonged discussion, was referred to the Pope, who, at the instance of Charles Borromeo, and quite contrary to the general opinion of the Fathers at the close of the debate, expressed himself favourable to the concession. In an affectionate brief, addressed to several bishops of Bavaria and Austria, he gave permission to distribute Holy Communion to the laity under *both* kinds. This permission, which was granted only for the sake of making a trial, was, after a short time, voluntarily surrendered by the laity themselves, owing to the many inconveniences attending the practice.[1]

The *decree on reformation* repeatedly reminds the clergy of the dignity of their high calling, exhorting them to lead a life in every way in keeping with it; urges the necessity of conferring canonries on worthy candidates; and insists on the conscientious administration of church property.

In the sittings preparatory to the *Twenty-third Session* a warm and animated discussion took place on the question of the *divine institution* of the episcopate. This gave occasion to the revival of the old controversy on the superiority of an Œcumenical Council to the Pope, between the Italian and Spanish bishops on the one side, and the lately arrived French bishops on the other.[2] The principles of the Roman School were earnestly and eloquently defended by the Italians, who maintained that the mission and jurisdiction of bishops are derived *solely from the authority of the Roman Pontiff.* Their efforts, however, to have their views adopted were unsuccessful. The Pope had instructed his Legates to guard the rights of the Holy See in the event of the Council taking up the question of the whole hierarchy of the Church. They were to see to it, not only that the

[1] Cf. *Pallavicini*, Lib. XXIV., towards the end. *Dieringer*, Charles Borromeo, Cologne, 1846, p. 172 sq. *Buchholtz*, Hist. of Ferd., Vol. VIII., p. 660.

[2] *Pallavicini*, Hist. conc. Trid., lib. XIX., cap. 5, nro. 5, informs us that the bishop, *Melchior Avosmediano* of Cadiz, was interrupted on the 1st December, 1562, in an unbecoming manner: Quidam studio sive immoderato sive affectato conclamarunt—*dimmitatur*—*anathema*—*comburatur, hæreticus est* (cf. nro. 8). Alii conati sunt aut pedum supplosione aut sibilo eum impedire.

Pope should receive separate and distinct mention as the Head of the Universal Church, but that his prerogatives should be enumerated in the words of the *Council of Florence*, and that they should not tolerate the statements there made to be in any wise enfeebled. But learning the conflicting opinions of the Fathers, Pius sent word that he would be content if no decision at all were expressed, whether concerning the authority of a bishop or of his own. Under any circumstances, no definition should be proclaimed that *had not the unanimous consent of the Fathers* (*unanimi consensu*). The *Cardinal of Lorraine* (Guise) expressed himself in favour of this course as at once moderate and conciliatory. "The true prosperity of the Holy See," said he, "depends not on this or that little word, which may more forcibly express its prerogatives, but on the obedience of nations and the peace of Christendom." He also expressed a wish that in those troubled times the Holy See would be content with its acknowledged authority and importance, without requiring them to be set forth in any more precise and explicit declarations. For himself, he said, he would submit his own judgment in the matter to that of the Pope and the authority of the Church.[1] The question of a definition on this point was then waived, and after the *eight canons*, condemnatory of the false doctrines on the Sacrament of Holy Orders, it was merely added that "if anyone say that the bishops, appointed by authority of the Roman Pontiff, are not true and lawful bishops, but of human institution, let him be anathema." As the *Pope's supremacy* had been virtually declared in a preceding Session,[2] this definition was accepted as sufficient.

The question as to *whether the duty of residence was binding upon bishops by human or divine law* was also warmly discussed, but finally dismissed without a formal definition. The *decree on reformation* (chap. I.), however, states that, "whereas, it is by divine precept enjoined on all, to whom the cure of souls is committed, to know their own sheep; to offer sacrifice for them; and by preaching of the divine word, by the administration of the Sacraments, and by the example of all good works, to feed them;" and whereas these offices cannot be performed by those who "abandon their flocks after the manner of hirelings, the Holy Synod admonishes and exhorts such that, mindful of the divine precepts, and *being patterns of their flocks*, they feed and rule in judgment and in truth." Therefore, all persons "set over cathedral churches are bound to personal residence," and may not be absent except when "Christian charity, urgent necessity, due

[1] Cf. *Pallavicini*, L. c., lib. XIX., c. 8, nro. 6, towards the end; cap. 15, nro. 3, at the end; cap. 16, nros. 6 and 9, towards the end.

[2] Sess. XIV., cap. VII., De Pœnitentia: Ss. patribus visum est, ut atrociora quædam et graviora crimina non a quibusvis, sed a summis duntaxat sacerdotibus absolverentur: unde merito *pontifices maximi pro summa potestate sibi in ecclesia universa tradita* causa aliquas criminum graviores suo potuerunt peculiari judicio reservare. Confer with this: Postremo sancta synodus (declarat), omnia et singula, quæ sub Paulo III., ac Julio III. et Pio IV. in hoc sacro concilio statuta sunt, ita decreta fuisse, ut in his *salva semper auctoritas sedis apostolicæ et sit et esse intelligatur*.

obedience, and the evident utility of the Church or of the Commonwealth" demand it, and then only when "these causes are approved in writing by the most blessed Roman Pontiff, or by the metropolitan, or, in his absence, by the oldest suffragan bishop."

By these exciting discussions, the *Twenty-third Session*, which was to be public and solemn, was delayed till the 15th July, 1563. There were present, besides the Papal Legates and the ambassadors of the emperor; of the kings of France, Spain, and Portugal; of the Republic of Venice, and of the Duke of Savoy, two hundred and eight bishops, many abbots and generals of religious orders, and a large number of doctors in theology. The doctrine, as set forth in this Session, concerning the Sacrament of *Holy Orders*, declares that there exists in the Catholic Church a *visible* priesthood, corresponding to the visible Sacrifice of the Eucharist; that this priesthood was instituted by Christ, and took the place of that of the Old Law; and that Christ gave to his Apostles and their successors the power of consecrating, offering up, and distributing his Body and Blood, as also that of forgiving and retaining sins. The Council further declared that, to the end that these functions might be more perfectly and worthily performed, the *hierarchical* degrees of major and minor Orders had been instituted, and that the *Sacrament* of Holy Orders sets an ineffaceable mark upon the soul of the recipient, insomuch that he who is once a priest can never cease to be such; and that, therefore, it shall not be lawful for anyone to say that this Sacrament and the ceremonies by which it is conferred are useless and void of meaning.

The *decree on reformation* sets forth the duties of bishops and cardinals regarding residence in the sense already described. Rules were next laid down *to be observed in the conferring of Orders*. It was also stated that such as had received priests' Orders should not administer the *Sacrament of Penance*, unless they possessed a benefice, to which was attached the cure of souls, or had been specially approved by the bishop for that office. Pre-eminent importance was attached to the ordinance, in the Eighteenth Chapter, providing *for the erection of diocesan seminaries for clerics*. The founding of *Seminaria puerorum*, it was urged, was necessary, "because youth, unless it be rightly trained, is prone to follow after the pleasures of the world; and unless it be formed, from its tender years, unto piety and religion, before habits of vice have taken possession of the whole man, it never will perfectly, and without the greatest and well-nigh special help of Almighty God, persevere in ecclesiastical discipline."

The Fathers looked forward to the foundation of seminaries as productive of so much good that they freely declared that the passing of this ordinance, had the Council accomplished no other work, would amply reward them for their labours. The Pope was the first to carry out its provisions by founding the *Roman Seminary*, and thus inspired the other bishops by his example.

The *Twenty-fourth Session*, held November 11, 1563, treated the

Sacrament of *Marriage* from a dogmatic point of view. In deference to the Venetian envoys, the actual condition of the Catholic Greeks was taken into account in the determination of this question, and, instead of directly defining *the absolute indissolubility of marriage*, the Seventh Canon puts the matter indirectly as follows: "If one say that the Church errs, in that she has taught and does teach, in accordance with the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the married parties, let him be anathema." The attitude of the Reformers, who had accused the Church of error on the question of marriage, rendered the above declaration necessary. It was also defined that the Church alone has the power to determine what are *the impediments dissolving marriage;* that any marriage, to be valid, must be performed in presence of *the pastor of the contracting parties* and *two* witnesses; and that ecclesiastical judges are alone competent to take cognizance of matrimonial causes. It was found necessary, in order to prevent clandestine marriages, to oblige the contracting parties to appear with witnesses before their pastor. The impediments of *kindred* were reduced, and the necessity of caution insisted on in the case of vagrants coming up to be married. Concubinage was declared a heinous sin, and severe penalties were pronounced against those guilty of it; and the civil powers received a threatening admonition not to interfere with the freedom of marriage.

The *decree on reformation* speaks of the duties of those whose right it is to select candidates for bishoprics; embodies a request asking the Pope, for the future, to appoint the cardinals from *all* Christian nations; ordains that *diocesan synods* shall be held annually, and *provincial councils* every three years; prescribes the manner of making the *visitation of churches* and administering a diocese during a vacancy; points out once more the qualifications to be possessed by those who are to be raised to canonries or other dignities in cathedral churches; and, finally, gives instructions regulating the conferring of benefices, and restricts the possession of a number of them (*pluralitas beneficiorum*) by one person.

A general desire was now expressed to have the Council come to a close, and the Pope's illness, which was daily showing more alarming symptoms, influenced the more prudent of the Fathers to acquiesce in the common wish. With the *Twenty-fifth Session* (December 3, 1563), therefore, the Great Council ended its labours. The decrees of this Session had reference to *Purgatory*, and the *Veneration of Saints, Images, and Relics.*[1] The teaching of the Church on Indulgences was given compendiously in an *appendix*. It is there

[1] Concerning purgatory: Synodus docet *Purgatorium* esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari. Apud rudem vero populum difficiliores ac subtiliores quæstiones, quæque ad ædificationem non faciunt —a popularibus concionibus secludantur. Ea quæ ad curiositatem quandam, aut super-

stated that the Church has received of God *the power of granting indulgences;* that these indulgences are *salutary;* but that they must be sparingly granted, *lest, if they should be obtained with two great ease, the discipline of the Church might become enfeebled.*[1] More than this it was unnecessary to say, as Pope *Leo X.*, in a bull, published in the year 1518, had fully defined and explained the doctrine on indulgences; but the Fathers wisely resolved not to put the question aside altogether, lest it might be thought they wished to shirk the very question that had given occasion to the schism.

The *decree on reformation* provides for the thorough reform of whatever pertains to the cloister; counsels cardinals and prelates to have a becoming, but modest household; pronounces severe punishment against those guilty of concubinage; speaks of the uses of excommunication; returns once more to the subjects of episcopal visitation, the conferring of benefices, the administration of church property; and, finally, remarks upon clerical exemptions and other kindred matters. It was also ordained that the Congregation, then engaged in preparing a *Catechism of the Council*, a new *Missal*, a *Breviary*, and an *Index of Forbidden Books*, should submit its work, when completed, to the Sovereign Pontiff, under whose special supervision it should be published.

Princes were called upon in the name of God to assist in having the decrees accepted, and in having them carried into effect. They were also besought to give in their own persons an example of their faithful observance. Finally, the two hundred and fifty-five Fathers present, of whom four were Legates, not including two other cardinals, twenty-five archbishops, one hundred and sixty-eight bishops, seven generals of religious orders, and seven abbots, subscribed the decrees of the Council, adding the words *subscripsi definiendo.* The thirty-five procurators, representing bishops, also subscribed, but with the addition *subscripsi judicando.*[2]

Of the German bishops only two, those of Constance and Brixen,

stitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum sapiunt, tanquam scandala et fidelium offendicula prohibeant Episcopi.

Concerning the *veneration of saints, images, and relics:* Mandat sancta synodus episcopis—ut juxta catholicæ et apostolicæ ecclesiæ usum—fideles diligenter instruant, Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre; bonum atque utile esse supliciter eos invocare; et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo *per filium ejus J. Chr. D. n., qui solus noster redemptor et salvator est*, ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere. Illos vero, qui negant, Sanctos invocandos esse—aut asserunt—invocationem esse idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi—imoie sentire.

Imagines porro Christi, Deiparæ virginis et aliorum sanctorum in templis præsertim habendas et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam: *non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis divinitas vel virtus* propter quam sint colendæ; vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum, vel *quod fiducia in imaginibus* sit figenda, veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, quæ in idolis spem suam collocabant; sed quoniam honos, qui eis exhibitur, refertur ad prototypa, quæ illæ repræsentant. Pope *Urban VIII.*, in the year 1642, gave still more explicit regulations on the use of images in churches in his bull "Sacrosancta." Cf. *Aschbach's* Eccl. Encyclopæd., Vol. I., p. 738.

[1] "Ne nimia facilitate ecclesiastica disciplina enervetur."

[2] Cf. on this point *Pallavicini*, L. c. lib. XXIV., c. 8, nros. 13 sq

were personally present; five others sent representatives. The Decrees of the Council were confirmed by Pius IV., who also caused a *Tridentine Profession of Faith* to be drawn up, which, he ordained, should be made, as an obligatory condition, by all those who might in future enter upon any ecclesiastical charge, or obtain any academic degree, and also by those who, renouncing Protestantism, should return to the Church.[1]

Still later on, under the pontificate of *Sixtus V.* (1588), a Congregation, the idea of which originated with Pius IV., was established,

[1] We insert the profession in full, because it contains a very masterly summary of the dogmas opposed to the new doctrines of Protestantism. "Ego N. firma fide credo et profiteor omnia et singula, quæ continentur in Symbolo fidei, quo Sancta Rom. Ecclesia utitur, videlicit; Credo in unum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, factorem cœli et terræ, visibilium omnium et invisibilium. Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei Unigenitum, et ex Patre natum ante omnia sæcula, Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero; genitum non factum, consubstantialem Patri, per quem omnia facta sunt, qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salutem, descendit de cœlis. Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto, ex Maria Virgine, et homo factus est. Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato, passus et sepultus est, et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas, et ascendit in cœlum, sedit ad dexteram Patris, et iterum venturus est cum gloria judicare vivos et mortuos, cujus regni non erit finis. Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et vivificantem, qui ex Patre Filioque procedit, qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur, qui locutus est per Prophetas. Et unam sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam. Confiteor unum Baptisma in remissionem peccatorum; et exspecto resurrectionem mortuorum, et vitam venturi sæculi. Amen.

"Apostolicas et Ecclesiasticas *traditiones* reliquasque ejusdem Ecclesiæ observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto et amplector. Item sacram scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et *interpretatione sacrarum scripturarum*, admitto, nec ea unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam et interpretabor. Profiteor quoque, *septem esse vere et proprie Sacramenta* novæ legis a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, atque ad salutem humani generis, licet non omnia singulis necessaria, scilicet Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Pœnitentiam, Extremam Unctionem, Ordinem et Matrimonium, illaque gratiam conferre et ex his Baptismum, Confirmationem et Ordinem sine sacrilegio reiterari non posse. Receptos quoque et approbatos Ecclesiæ Catholicæ ritus in supradictorum omnium Sacramentorum solemni administratione recipio et admitto. Omnia et singula quæ de *peccato originali et de justificatione* in Sacrosancta Trid. Synodo definita et declarata fuerunt, amplector et recipio. Profiteor pariter in *Missa offerri Deo verum, proprium et propitiatorium sacrificium* pro vivis et defunctis, atque in sanctissimo *Eucharistiæ Sacramento* esse *vere, realiter et substantialiter Corpus et Sanguinem* una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, fierique conversionem totius substantiæ panis in Corpus et totius substantiæ vini in Sanguinem, quam conversionem Catholica Ecclesia Transsubstantiationem appellat. Fateor etiam, *sub altera tantum specie* totum atque integrum Christum verumque Sacramentum sumi. Constanter teneo *Purgatorium esse*, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari. Similiter et *Sanctos, una cum Christo regnantes, venerandos atque invocandos esse*, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre, atque eorum reliquias esse venerandas. Firmissime assero imagines Christi ac Deiparæ semper Virginis, necnon aliorum Sanctorum habendas et retinendas esse, atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam. *Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem a Christo in Ecclesia relictam fuisse, illarumque usum Christiano populo maxime salutarem esse* affirmo. Sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam omnium Ecclesiarum matrem et magistram agnosco; Romanoque Pontifici, beati Petri, Apostolorum Principis, successori, ac Jesu Christi Vicario veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro. Cætera item omnia a sacris Canonibus et œcumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipue a sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo tradita, definita et declarata indubitanter recipio atque profiteor, simulque contraria omnia atque hæreses quascumque ab Ecclesia damnatas et rejectas et anathematizatas ego pariter damno, rejicio et anathematizo. Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in præsenti sponte profiteor et veraciter teneo, eandem integram et inviolatam usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum constantissime, Deo adju

whose special office it was to interpret of the Council of Trent (*Interpretes Concilii Tridentini*).[1]

A very cursory examination of the Sessions of this celebrated Council will convince every fair-minded person that no former Synod ever handled so great a number of subjects with such marked ability, or defined so many doctrines with such precision and prudence. Men holding the extremest divergency of opinions met there as upon a common and neutral ground; exchanged views with one another, the conservatism of some correcting the extravagance of others; and the result was a doctrinal equilibrium, which gave the steadiness and mental rest so necessary to the religious intellect of that age.

Of the bishops who attended the Council, the Spaniards were distinguished for the critical acumen and ability which they displayed in harmonising the points of apparent conflict between speculative theology and the facts of Church History. It is doubtful if a council assembled at the *present* day would have among its members as large a number of eminent men.[2] How calm, and yet how truly earnest and sincere is the zeal for *real reform* which distinguishes this Council! What happy changes, how large a measure of genuine progress, would now be before the world had the decrees been as faithfully executed and observed, as they were loyally conceived, and their realization ardently desired, by those holy representatives of the Catholic faith.

The decrees of the Council, confirmed by a papal bull of the 6th of January, 1564, were at once received[3] without restriction in *Venice*, in the principal States of *Italy*, in *Portugal*, and in *Poland*; in *Spain*, in *Naples*, and in the *Low Countries*, they were published by Philip II., who, however, added the qualification: "Without detriment to the royal prerogatives." As a rule, the promulgation was made through the medium of provincial synods, held for this special purpose in 1564, and measures were adopted for having the Decrees carried into execution. After the death of Ferdinand I., in 1564, they were published by *Maximilian II.*, in the States of the Empire; and received by the Catholic Princes of Germany at the Diet of Augsburg, in 1566.

vante, retinere et confiteri, atque a meis subditis, vel illis, quorum cura ad me in munere meo spectabit, teneri, doceri et prædicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum, ego idem N. spondeo, voveo ac juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet et hæc sancta Dei evangelia." Cf. *Liguori*, Explanations of the Dogmatic Decrees of the Holy Council of Trent, translated into German by *Hugues*, Ratisbon, 1845. *Nampon*, Investigations of the Doctrines of the Council of Trent, translated from the French, Ratisbon, 1854, 2 parts. *Clarus*, Tridentine Symbol of Faith Proved by the Scriptures, Reason and History, 2 vols., Schaffh., 1865 sq.

[1] Cf. *Zamboni*, De hujus congreg. institutione, privilegiis atque officio, in the præfatio ad collect. declarationum s. congreg. conc. quæ a. 1812 sq. prodiit.

[2] The Venetian *Jerome Ragosini*, Bishop of Nazianzum in partibus and coadjutor of Famagosta, exaggerated nothing when in the beautiful valedictory which he delivered before the representatives of the Council, he said: "Ex omnium populorum ac nationum, in quibus catholicæ religionis veritas agnoscitur, non solum Patres, sed et oratores habuimus. At quos viros? Si doctrinam spectemus, eruditissimos—si usum, peritissimos—si ingenia, perspicacissimos—si pietatem religiosissimos—si vitam, innocentissimos."

[3] Cf. *Pallavicini*, L. c., lib. XXIV., c. 11 sq.

In *France* the *dogmatic* Decrees were accepted without qualification; but those relating to discipline were introduced only after protracted delays, notwithstanding that the Pope and the bishops exerted all their influence in their favour. The decrees to which the greatest exception was taken related to *fines* and *imprisonment* inflicted at the discretion of ecclesiastical authority; to *duelling*, the penalties for which were visited not alone upon the duellists themselves, but also upon their seconds and those who came to witness the encounter (Sess. XXV., ch. 19); to *concubinage* and *adultery;* to those which made bishops amenable only to the Pope, &c.

There was also another cause of serious complaint, in that the Council had declared that the consent of the parents was not necessary to the valid marriage of their children, while by French law such consent was *absolutely* required.

§ 344. *Other Popes of this Epoch.*

Onofrio, Platina restitutus c. additione a Sixto IV.—Pium IV., Ven., 1562, 4. *Raynaldi*, Ann. *A. Theineri*, Continuat. Baronii annal. T. I.-III.—*A. du Chesne*, Histoire des papes. Par., 1646, f. cont. (up to Paul V.) par Fr. du Chesne. Par., 1658. 2 T. f. *Ranke*, The Roman Pontiffs in the 16th and 17th centuries. 4th ed., Brl., 1854. 3 vols.[1] *Reumont*, Hist. of the City of Rome. Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 534 sq. *Haas*, History of the Popes, p. 541 sq. *Groene*, the History of the Popes, Vol. II., p. 322 sq.

Pius IV. raised his nephew, *Charles Borromeo*, to the dignity of the cardinalate, and there is no act of his whole pontificate that carried with it more blessings to the Church. He also left an example worthy of imitation by his successors in establishing permanently a Congregation, to which he assigned the special office of *interpreting and carrying into execution the Decrees of the Council of Trent.*[2] He was succeeded by *Pius V.* (1566-1572), a member of the Order of St. Dominic. The piety and the zeal of this humble friar for the well-being of the Church, and his never-ceasing vigilance in keeping bishops to their duties, raised him so high in the esteem of the other members of the College of Cardinals, that when the papal throne fell vacant he was at once called to fill it.[3] He personally served the sick in the hospitals, and thus exhibited an illustrious example of humility; he enforced the decrees of Trent, with the powerful aid of Charles Borromeo, and thus achieved conquests the most glorious for the Church. To him is Christendom mainly indebted for the splendid victory gained at *Le-*

[1] While this, like all the other productions of *Ranke*, possesses unusual merit, the animus of the writer is exhibited in numerous passages like the following: "Our fatherland (Germany) has acquired the undying fame of restoring Christianity to a purer form than it possessed since the first centuries—*of discovering again the true religion.* Vol. I., p. 129.

[2] *Leonardi*, Oratio de laudibus Pii IV. Pad., 1565.

[3] *Catena*, Vita del P. Pio V. Rom., 1586. 4to. *Gabutii*, De vita Pii V., Rom., 1605, fol. (*Bolland.*, Acta SS. m. Maji, T. I., p. 616). *Maffei*, Vita di S. Pio. Rom., 1712, 4to. *Bzovii*, Pius V., Rom., 1672 fol. *Chiapponi*, Acta canoniz. P., Rom., 1720.

panto, over the Turks, by Don John of Austria (1571). He also commanded that the bull "*In cœna Domini*," should be publicly read on Maundy Thursday,[1] not only in Rome, but throughout all Christian countries. This bull, the provisions of which may be traced back in the rescripts of many popes, chiefly of the fifteenth century, to the pontificate of Urban V. (1363), in its original text, condemned and pronounced sentence of anathema upon heretics, brigands, and pirates; upon those who should interfere with the legitimate jurisdiction of bishops, lay imposts upon the Church without the Pope's consent, or bring criminal action against ecclesiastics; and upon such as should supply the Saracens or other enemies of the Christian name with arms, do violence to pilgrims, or seize the property of the Pope. It also *cut off Protestants from the communion of the Church*, and set forth a claim to the prerogatives enjoyed by the Church during the Middle Ages. Its publication was firmly opposed by many princes and even some bishops in their respective states and dioceses. There is no question that Pius V. had the very best intentions in taking these rigorous measures; but their only effect was to alienate the good-will of many, without working any results at all adequate to his aims. The last edition of this bull was published by authority of Urban VIII., in 1627, and its yearly proclamation suspended by Clement XIV., in 1770. Pius V. was beatified by Clement X., in 1672, and canonized by Clement XI.

Gregory XIII. (Hugo Buoncompagno, 1572-1585) succeeded to Pius V. That he was deeply versed in law and the natural sciences is amply attested by *the new edition, which he published, of Canon Law*,[2] and by his corrections of the *Julian Calendar* (1582), which had then become so faulty that it was ten days behind the true time according to the solar year. Gregory was also a lover of the fine arts and fond of magnificent displays, but in these things he had in view the gratification of no personal vanity, but only the good of the Church, and the interests of his subjects. Prompted by such motives, he founded, at Rome, *six colleges*, which were respectively for *the Irish, the Germans*,[3] *the Jews, the Greeks, the Maronites or Christians of Mount Lebanon, and the youth of Rome*. The latter was the one which until recently has been known as the Roman or Jesuit College (*Collegio al Gesu*), and contained twenty auditories and three hundred cells. He also established *nunciatures* at Lucerne in 1579, at Vienna in 1581, and at Cologne in 1582. This outline will give an imperfect idea of his labours in the interests of the Church.

Sixtus V. (Peretti, 1585-1590), Gregory's successor, was in early

[1] Hence the name "*In cœna Domini*," although the bull commences with the words: "Pastoralis Rom. Pontif. vigilantia," in the magnum bullarium T. II., p. 189. Cf. *Le Bret's* Pragmatic history of the bull in cœna Dom. Frkf. and Lps., 1769 sq., 4 vols., and the *Historico-political Papers*, Vol. XXI., p. 57-82.

[2] *Ciappi*, Comp. delle attioni e. s. vita di Greg. XIII. Rom. (1591) 1596. 4to.

[3] *Cordara*, Historia collegii Germanici et Hungarici, Rom., 1770, 4to., p. 53 sq. The German College in Rome, its foundation and commencement (Historical and Political Papers of 1842, Vol. IX., p. 236 sq., 293 sq.)

life a herdsman.[1] Having entered the Order of St. Francis, he gave proof of such extraordinary ability that, in 1570, he was created cardinal. He concealed under a modest exterior and humble deportment unusual capacity for government. His firm, austere, and unbending character well-fitted him to be a Pope such as the times required, when the Church had to contend against Protestant princes as perfidious in their professions as they were unscrupulous in carrying out their designs. Original in conception, he was indefatigable in exertion, and wielded an influence among his contemporaries which left a permanent impress upon the events of that age. His name is so intimately bound up with the traditions of the people that the modern historian experiences no little difficulty in sifting the historical from the mythical. The diplomatist, Baron von *Huebner*, in our own day, has probably furnished the best materials for arriving at a just appreciation of the character of this extraordinary man. None knew better than Sixtus how to profit by the circumstances of the times, and none could have displayed greater skill and tact in making the Catholic princes allies of the Holy See. He never rested until he had ridded the States of the Church of the brigands who infested them. The protector of the poor, he encouraged the industry and stimulated the activity of his subjects. By steadily adhering to the rule of raising only worthy persons to the higher ecclesiastical dignities he effectually suppressed the evil of nepotism in the College of Cardinals.

He built magnificent halls in the *Vatican Library*, which he filled with the most precious monuments of antiquity; he published a new edition of the Septuagint, and the new and *corrected* (though defective) *edition of the Vulgate*, promised by the Council of Trent; he reorganized the administration of public affairs by establishing *fifteen Congregations* (1588); he had the great obelisk *set up*, which Caligula had brought from Egypt to Rome; he completed the cupola of St. Peter's Church; he constructed the superb aqueduct on the Quirinal Hill (*Aqua Felice*) for supplying the city with abundance of pure water; and, finally he left to his successor a well-filled exchequer which furnished ample revenues for all the requirements of government.

Urban VII., *Gregory XIV.*, and *Innocent IX.*, the immediate successors to Sixtus, lived only long enough to have their names recorded in the catalogue of popes.

The reign of *Clement VIII.* (Aldobrandini of Florence, 1592-1605), was both longer and of greater importance. He had the happiness of reconciling Henry IV. of France to the Church, and of

[1] *Robardi*, Sixti V. gesta quinquennalia, Rom., 1590, 4to. *Leti*, Vita di Sisto V., Losanna, 1669; 2 T., then 3 T., French Par., 1702, 2 T. *Tempesti*, Storia della vita e geste di Sisto V., Rom., 1755, 2 T., 4to. Sixtus V. and his Times, by Lorenz, Mentz, 1852. *Ranke*, Popes, Vol. III., and *Historical* and *Political Papers*, Vol. IX., p. 235 sq., 293 sq. Baron von *Huebner* (Ambassador of Austria in Paris and Rome), Sixtus V., German ed. by the author, Lps., 1871, 2 vols. (The original in French, Paris, 1870, 3 vols.) Bonn Theological Review, 1870, nros. 16, 17; 1871, nro. 4.

establishing peace between Austria and Spain by the treaty of *Vervins*. He got possession of the Duchy of Ferrara, which on the extinction of the House of *Este*, reverted as a fief to the Holy See. By raising *Baronius*, *Tolet*, *Bellarmine*, *d'Ossat*, and *Du Perron* to the cardinalate he showed that he knew how to appreciate learning and reward virtue. In 1592 he published a new *edition of the Vulgate*. Owing to overhaste the edition issued in the pontificate of Sixtus was found to be incorrect, and, in consequence, Clement had his thoroughly revised, and so perfect is it that since his time no emendations have been thought necessary. He also began a revision of the *Breviary*, and established the famous *Congregatio de Auxiliis*[1] for deciding questions arising out of the Dominican and Jesuit controversy on grace. By the publication of an impressive encyclical, addressed to the whole world, he attracted three millions of pilgrims to Rome on the occasion of the customary jubilee at the opening of the century.

Had not the intrigues of the Spanish party prevented it, the learned Cardinal Baronius would have succeeded to Clement. As it was, their votes elected Cardinal *Octavianus Medici*, of Florence, who was crowned, taking the name of *Leo XI.* The hopes which the election of so considerable a personage inspired vanished with his death after a reign of twenty-seven days. He was succeeded by *Paul V.* (Borghese of Rome, 1605-1621) who had displayed uncommon diplomatic skill and ability in an embassy to Spain committed to him by Clement VIII.

He was learned, pious, skilled in the art of governing, and zealous for the reformation of the manners of the clergy. He contributed largely to the adornment of St. Peter's and other churches; introduced the Perpetual Adoration or Forty Hours' Devotion of the Blessed Sacrament; and left behind him an enduring reputation as an efficient and exemplary Pope, in spite of the complaint of some that in the matter of *legal technicality* he was unnecessarily exacting and punctilious.

His protracted quarrel with the Republic of *Venice* has given rise to much discussion and not a little adverse criticism. This State had prohibited the building of churches and hospitals *without its special authorization*; forbidden real estate or other immovable property to be conveyed by last will to ecclesiastics; and ordered offending members of the clergy to be cited before civil tribunals. Against these measures Paul protested. The Senate of the Republic refused to yield. As a consequence the Pope, after taking council with the cardinals, excommunicated the Doge, and laid the States under interdict (April 17, 1606). The Senate resisted, declaring the action of the Pope unjust, and prohibiting, under the severest penalties, the publication of the papal brief within the territories of Venice; but at the same time commanding that the usual divine services should

[1] Cf. *Schroedl*, in the Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. II., pp. 786-794. Fr. trans., Vol V., pp. 194-203.

not be discontinued. The bulk of the regular clergy, including Capuchins, Theatines, and Jesuits, withdrew from the territory of the Republic in obedience to the voice of the successor of Peter; the secular clergy remained, and continued to celebrate divine worship. To this civic contest was added another of a more spiritual character. *Paul Sarpi*, a Servite monk, professing to be a tenacious champion of what he was pleased to designate as the rights of the Republic, encouraged the people in their resistance by impressing upon them, as he said, a true appreciation of their privileges. He was answered by *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*, who maintained the cause of the Pope. Henry IV., now a zealous son of the Church, interposed his good offices and adjusted the dispute. The *Capuchins* and *Theatines* were again permitted to enter the Venetian States, but the *Jesuits* were commanded not to return.[1] Paul V. very properly forbade the English Catholics to take the Test Oath required of them under the pretext that they had been accomplices in the Gunpowder Plot. When the news reached him of the assassination of Henry IV. by Ravaillac, he was unable to control the manifestations of his sorrow.

Gregory XV. (Ludovisio of Bologna, a pupil of the Jesuits, 1621-1623) went from one ecclesiastical dignity to another until he finally reached the papal throne. He gave fine promise, and his future course was looked forward to with unusual interest. Neither did he disappoint those who put confidence in him. It was he who gave to papal elections the forms they have ever since preserved, ordaining that cardinals in casting their votes should not make known the person of their choice. To elect, a two-thirds vote is required. There are four modes of electing, viz., "*scrutiny*," or an examination of the votes deposited by the cardinals in a chalice placed upon the altar; "*access*," or the changing of a sufficient number of votes, which, when added to those already given for any candidate, will secure his election; "*compromise*," or the concurrent action of *all* the cardinals transferring their right of election to a committee of their own body; and, finally, "*quasi-inspiration*,"[2] or a public and general movement in obedience to which the election of some particular candidate is carried by acclamation.

After the taking of Heidelberg in 1622, Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria, to remunerate the Pope for subsidies contributed during a number of years, presented to the Vatican Library a large collection of works, and among them many ancient manuscripts,[3] from the

[1] A Survey of the Situation of Venice at the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century (Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. XI., p. 129 sq.

[2] *Ingoli*, Cæremoniale ritus election. Rom. Pont., Rom., 1621. *Lunadoro*, Relazione della corte di Roma, ed. 5, Rom., 1824, 2 T., 12mo. This work in an earlier edition by *Andrea Tosi*, trans. into Germ. by *Bertram*, Halle, 1771. †**Kopatsch*, Vacancy and Filling of the Apostolic See, Innsbr., 1843. *Zoepfel*, The Elections of Popes, and accompanying ceremonies, in their development from the eleventh to the fourteenth century, Goetting, 1872.

[3] *A. Theiner*, Donation of the Heidelberg Library to Pope Gregory XV., by Maximilian I., Munich, 1844 A small portion of the MSS. (mostly Greek) carried to Paris

library of the Elector Palatine. Gregory was chosen by Austria and Spain to arbitrate a dispute concerning the *Valteline*, in the country of the Grisons. He also established the Congregation of the Propaganda (*Congregatio de propaganda fide*), with a special view of bringing heretics back to the Church. Its scope, however, was subsequently extended, and through the influence exerted by it, missionary work of every kind received a fresh impulse. Finally, he honoured the Society of Jesus and increased the consideration in which that body was already held by canonizing *Ignatius Loyola* and *Francis Xavier*, and declaring *Aloysius Gonzaga* beatified.

Urban VIII. (Barberini, 1623-1644) was Gregory's successor on the papal throne. He was an experienced statesman, an eminent scholar, and an elegant poet. His collection of Latin poems, hymns, and odes rank among the best literary productions of modern times. He bestowed upon the cardinals (1630) the title of eminence (*eminentissimus*); published (1643) for the use of the Universal Church a new and *amended edition of the Breviary;* enlarged the powers of the Congregation of the Propaganda, placing under its control the Urban College (*Collegium Urbanum*), which has since become so celebrated; and, after the death, in 1626, of *Francis Maria*, the last Duke of the House of Rovere, united the duchy of Urbino to the States of the Church. He is charged with being too intent upon enriching the members of his family, and raising them to places of honour and distinction, thus exposing them to the hardships they endured under his successors.

The friends of Urban favoured the election of *Innocent X.* (Card. Pamphili of Rome, 1644-1655), believing that, since he had been raised to the cardinalate by that pope, he would now treat his relatives with consideration. Being utterly disappointed in their hopes, they exposed themselves by imprudent acts to just punishment, which occasionally was hardly distinguishable from persecution. A war, already threatened during the lifetime of Urban, now broke out and raged fiercely between Innocent and the Duke of Parma, the latter of whom was charged with causing the assassination of a bishop appointed against his will to the see of *Castro*. Papal troops assaulted and took the citadel of Castro, and the duchy of the same name was incorporated among the States of the Church. The Barberini were now summoned, for the first time, to give an account to the Papal Court of the revenues hitherto administered by them, and the result not being satisfactory, they were deprived of their offices, which passed into the hands of the relatives of Innocent, at whose instance the investigation was set on foot. Foreseeing the storm and wishing to escape it, the Barberini at the first outbreak of the persecution against them fled to France, and Innocent, to prevent a similar flight in future, published a bull forbidding any cardinal to leave the States

in the time of Napoleon I., were restored to Heidelberg in 1815. About eight hundred more, relating to the Middle Ages, were restored by the Pope in the shape of a present.

of the Church without the authorization of the Pope. Through the friendly offices of the French Government the fugitives were permitted to return and take possession of their estates. But apart from this family quarrel there was another and more serious subject of complaint against Innocent, namely, the influence which, it was well known, *Olympia Maldachina*, his brother's widow, exercised in the affairs of the Church.[1] While it is a fact, admitted on all hands, that his morals were above reproach, his conduct in this particular cannot be wholly excused. Of his connection with the *Peace of Westphalia* an account will be given in § 356.

§ 345*a*. *The Papacy.*

In spite of the threats and assaults of the Protestants, who had sworn to bring about the fall of the Papacy, there was still in Catholic countries a very considerable portion of the inhabitants who continued to regard the Holy See with reverence, and to respect its ancient authority. Among its ablest champions were the Jesuits, who, while advocating apparently opposite principles, such, for example, as "that all royal authority comes from the people," whence, like the leading Reformers, they concluded that certain circumstances might arise in which it would be lawful *to put a tyrant to death*,[2] were nevertheless the most skilful and powerful defenders of the political theocracy of the Middle Ages. Encouraged by these evidences of loyalty, *Urban VIII.* again put forth the claims of *Pius V.*, and gave to the bull "*In cœna Domini*" its final form.[3] *Nunciatures* were established by the Popes in the most important cities of the Christian world, for the twofold purpose of protecting the rights of the Holy See, and regulating the affairs of the Church with greater ease and expedition. Of those appointed to bishoprics the Popes reserved to themselves the right of selecting some and of confirming all. As *Bellarmine*, *Mariana*, *Suarez*, and *Santarel*[4] had been the ablest advocates of the papal power, such as it existed in the Middle Ages, so were they now the most conspicuous defenders of the bull "*In cœna Domini.*" They were opposed by *Paul Sarpi*, "*the theologian of the republic*" of

[1] Even *Ranke*, The Roman Pontiffs, &c., 3rd ed., Vol. III., in the Appendix, p. 242, says, concerning her supposed liaison with Innocent X., according to *Leti*, Vita di Donna Olimpia Maldachina, 1666, "*that there is not a word of truth in the story.*"

[2] It seems to be taken for granted that only *Catholic* writers, like *Mariana*, *Santarel*, and *Boucher* (De justa Henrici III. abdicatione), have held that there may be circumstances in which the putting of a tyrant to death is justifiable. People seem wholly ignorant of the fact that *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, and the Calvinist *Junius Brutus*, held that oppressive sovereigns should be killed. An observation in point may be here quoted from *Hugo Grotius:* "Liber flagitiosissimus Boucheri de abdicatione Henrici III. non argumentis tantum, sed et verbis desumptus est, non ex Mariana aut Santarello, sed e *Junio Bruto.*" Appendix de Antichr., Amst., 1641, p. 59.

[3] Bullar. Roman., T. IV., p. 118 sq. Cf. above, p. 437, note 1.

[4] *Mariana*, De Rege et Regis institutione, Tolet., 1598. Germn. ed. by *Riedel*, Darmstadt, 1843. *Bellarminus*, De potestate Summi Pontif. in temporal, Rom., 1610. *Suarez*, Defensio fidei cath. adv. anglic. sectæ error, Conimbr., 1613. *Santarel*, De hæresi et schismate.

Venice, and by *Edmond Richer*, the author of a history of the Œcumenical Councils, who maintained the rights of bishops and national churches with equal ability and unfairness. The arguments of Sarpi were directed chiefly against the Jesuits; "for," said he, "to triumph over the Jesuits is to triumph over Rome, and Rome once overcome religion will work out its own reformation." Richer publicly maintained that the *States General* are above the king, and that Jacques Clement, in assassinating Henry III. for not keeping his sworn promises, had justly avenged his country and his country's liberties. He was, in consequence, arrested and imprisoned, and did not obtain his liberty until after he had submitted his work, *De Ecclesia et politica potestate* (Paris, 1611), to the judgment of the Holy See (1629).

§ 345*b*. *The Secular and Regular Clergy.—Revival of Synods.*

Although the *College of Cardinals*, at the period of which we are now writing, included among its members some who were unworthy of their exalted position, having been raised to it because they chanced to be the nephews of popes, it also contained many more, distinguished for the purity of their faith, the extent of their learning, and the warmth of their zeal, who gave abundant proof of talent, prudence, and capacity in the legatine missions with which they were intrusted. The names of Cardinals *Cajetan*, *Pole*, *Contareni*, *Del Monte*, *Cervini*, *Hosius*, and *Charles Borromeo*, of *Francis Commendone*, the Pope's Chamberlain, and Bishop *Delphini*, will at once occur to the mind of the reader. The last two-named were sent to the Diet of Naumburg, in 1561, and by their energy and address, no less than by their forcible and polished eloquence, greatly embarrassed the action of the Protestant princes.[1]

Unfortunately the sloth, the perfidy, and the apostasy of *bishops*, secular clergy, and monks were only too frequently the occasion of shame and disaster to the Church. It was the complaint of Eck that the bishops of Germany gave more attention to temporal than to spiritual affairs, and the letter of the Elector Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, to Luther,[2] is ample proof that the complaint was just. It is a comfort to know that there is no other instance of so detestable a treason in so exalted a personage. As if to atone in some manner for the mischief and dishonour which this prelate brought upon the Church, *Jerome Scultetus*, Bishop of Brandenburg, and *Adolphus*, Bishop of Merseburg, carried the war into the very camp of the enemy, and in the theatre of Luther's labours fearlessly proclaimed and triumphantly defended the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

The holding of *diocesan* and *provincial synods* was the most urgent need of the Church during this epoch, and Rome had only to blame her own centralizing policy for their interruption. Had they been

[1] Cf. *Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. XIII., ch. 7; lib. XV., ch. 2-6, and 8; lib. XXIV., ch. 13. **Dieringer*, St. Charles Borromeo, pp. 147-155.

[2] See §§ 276, 277, and p. 190.

regularly held, the Lutheran controversy in all probability would not have been brought before the Diets of the Empire for adjudication; the disorders of the clergy would certainly not have been so scandalous, and the religious instruction and moral training of the people would not have been so shamelessly neglected. The Councils of Basle and Lateran (V.) had already made earnest but ineffectual efforts to enforce the duty of holding *synods*, ordaining that the *diocesan* should be called *annually*, and the *provincial* every *three years*. Hence the Council of Trent, to remedy the evil, ordained (Sess. XXIV., *De reformatione*, c. 2) that provincial councils, wherever omitted, should be renewed and held every third year, "for regulating morals, correcting excesses, settling controversies, and for other purposes allowed by the canons;" and that "diocesan synods shall also be held yearly."

Charles Borromeo was the first to carry out the decrees of Trent in his own diocese of Milan, and his example was followed by the bishops of every Catholic country, as the catalogue of the provincial councils of the epoch, to which reference will be made farther on, clearly shows. Unfortunately the practice of holding synods again ceased to be observed in nearly every country of Christendom towards the close of the eighteenth century in spite of the frequent and earnest exhortations of Pope *Benedict XIV.*[1] The Council of Trent was equally solicitous in providing for the *formation of a new clergy* (Sess. XXIII., *De reformatione*, ch. 18). Seminaries for the instruction and training of clerics were to be erected in every diocese, and those intended for the service of the Church were to be entered while yet of a tender age.[2] "If the Catholic world has had for the last three hundred years," says Bishop *Hefele*, "a more learned, a more moral, and a more pious clergy, than that which existed in almost every country at the time of the so-called Reformation, and whose tepidity and faithlessness contributed largely to the growth of the schism, it is wholly due to the decree of the Council of Trent, and to it we in this age owe our thanks."[3] *St. Charles Borromeo* in Italy, and *St. Vincent de Paul* in France, as they were the first to carry this decree into effect, so were they the most earnest. As seminaries could not be established in Germany on account of the circumstances of the times, *St. Ignatius Loyola* founded in Rome the *German College* (*Collegium Germanicum*), for the education of the German clergy. The establishment was endowed and placed on a permanent basis by Gregory XIII.[4] Those that went out from this college were, as *Julius III.* expressed it, to become the fearless champions of the faith

[1] In his work *De Synodo Diœcesana*, where he also instructs bishops as to the character, object, and limits of these synods. Cf. *Phillips*, Diocesan Synods, p. 84 sq.

[2] Cf. *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclopæd., s. v. Seminary, Clerical, in Vol. X. Fr. trans., vol. 21, p. 479 sq.

[3] *Hefele*, The Vicissitudes of the Church since the Council of Trent. Tuebing. Quart. Review, nro. 1, p. 24 sq.

[4] See p. 437.

where it already existed, and its apostles where it was still to be introduced. In Germany itself, *Bartholomew Holzhauser*, who was born at Langenau, near Ulm, in 1613, and died at Bingen, in 1658, founded the *Institute of the Brothers of the Common Life*, for secular priests (*Collegium Fratrum in communi viventium*), in 1640, at Salzburg, whence it was introduced into the dioceses of Augsburg, Mentz, and Coire, and became a source of many and great blessings to Germany, particularly after the close of the devastating Thirty Years' War.[1] So marked was its success, and so popular did the institute become, that it was soon introduced into Hungary, Spain, and Poland. *San Felice*, the Papal Nuncio at Cologne, characterized its statutes as a "*medulla canonum.*"

§ 346. *The Order of the Jesuits.*

Autobiography of St. Ignatius. (*Bolland.*, Acta ss. mens. Jul., T. VII., p. 409). *Ribadeneirœ*, Vita Ignatii, libri V., Neap., 1572. (German, Ingolstadt, 1614.) *Maffei*, De vita et moribus Ignatii Loyolæ, Rom., 1585, 4to. †**Genelli*, S. J., Life of St. Ignatius Loyola, Innsbruck, 1847. Constt. regulæ, decreta congregationum, censuræ et præcepta c. litteris Apostol. et privileg. (institutum S. J. ex decreto congreg. general. XIV., Prag., 1705, 2 V.) *Holsten. Brockie*, T. III., p. 121 sq. Hist. S. J. a *Nicol. Orlandino, Sacchino, Juvencio*, etc., Rom. et Antv., 1615-1750, 6 T., fol. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., pp. 92-217. *Ribadeneira, Allegambe*, et *Sotwel*, Bibl. scriptor. S. J., Antv., 1643. *Lagomarsini*, Testimonia viror. illustr. S. J. *Bartoli*, Hist. of the Order of Jesuits. Germ. Würzburg, 1845. Crétineau-Joly, Hist. of the Society of Jesus, from a religious, political, and literary point of view, 6 vols., 8vo., Paris, 1845-46. Germ. Vienna, 1845 sq., 5 vols. In the same spirit further developments of the Hist. of the Society of Jesus, by *Brühl*, 1846; by *Buss*, Mentz, 1853; by *Daurignac*, Germ. by *Clarus*, Ratisbon, 1864. 2 vols.

The Religious Orders, whose members were more numerous than the secular clergy, showed themselves utterly unequal to the task of grappling with the dangers that menaced the Church. Some, in whom the fire of charity had become extinct, remained passive spectators of the conflict; while others embraced the errors of the day, and passed over to the camp of the enemy. A committee appointed by Paul III. to examine and report upon the condition of the monks, gave it as their opinion, that the communities of those religious houses, in which discipline had become relaxed, and manners dissolute, should be allowed to die out, when others more zealous and honest might take their place. The secular clergy were no better than the monks, and the Church could not look to them for any effective assistance in the supreme hour of her trial. But while faith seemed extinct in the hearts of men consecrated to the special service of God, it was living, active, and energetic in the Church, producing, at this time, a new Religious Order, which, apparently growing out of the circumstances of the age, was, for this very reason, peculiarly fitted to minister to its needs. Specially designed to repel the advances of Protestantism, this Order has at all times filled the Protestant mind with vague and undefined terrors. Protestants, as a

[1] *Gaduel*, Bartholomew Holzhauser. Tr. from the French into Germ., Mentz, 1862. See *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I., p. 634; Fr. tr., Vol. II., p. 365 sq.

rule, have regarded the great Society as an enemy to the human race, formidable indeed, but deserving the execration of all good men; and even Catholics, while professing true allegiance to the Church, have judged it erroneously, and condemned it unjustly. To give a fair and faithful account of its origin and character is, therefore, now, perhaps more than in any age since its foundation, the duty of the historian.

Ignatius, the founder of this Society, was the descendant of a noble Spanish family, and was born at Loyola, in 1491. In his early life he embraced the profession of arms, and was wounded at the siege of Pampeluna, in 1521, where he distinguished himself by his gallantry. During the long and weary season of his convalescence, having exhausted his stock of romances, he took to reading the Holy Scriptures and the Lives of the Saints, and, like St. Francis of Assisi, was inspired with the desire of conquering the happiness and glory of heaven by enduring the contempt and sufferings of the world. He made up his mind that as soon as he should be perfectly restored to health, he would enter upon a more austere manner of life, set out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and there labour for the conversion of the infidel. Having gone to the Holy Land, he fell in, at Jerusalem, with the provincial of the Franciscans, who advised him to give up his design, which he did, and returned to Europe. It was at this time that the idea of founding a new Religious Order came up to his mind. To give it practical shape required more learning than he then possessed, but he was not ashamed to take his place on the benches with the children of the grammar-school, and begin to master the rudiments of Latin. He completed his academical studies at the Universities of *Alcalá*, *Salamanca*, and *Paris*. While at the last-named place, he prevailed upon some of his fellow-students to adopt his austere mode of life, of whose transforming power his own experience at Manresa was sufficient evidence. These young men in turn helped him on in his studies, and with their assistance he was enabled, in 1534, to pass creditably through a rigorous examination for the degree of doctor. His principal associates were *Peter Lefèvre*, a Savoyard; *Francis Xavier*, a Navarrese; *James Lainez*, *Alphonsus Salmeron*, and *Nicholas Bobadilla*, all Spaniards, and a Portuguese named *Rodriguez*. Sometime later he was joined by *Lejay*, another Savoyard, *John Codure*, and *Pascal Broet*, the former a native Dauphine, and the latter of Picardy. As their ideas matured, they gave a wider scope to their plans, and decided to devote themselves to the care of souls. Relinquishing for the time the Eastern project, Ignatius, accompanied by Lefèvre and Lainez, repaired to Rome, in 1539, and submitted the rule of the proposed new Order to Pope Paul III. Their vow, in addition to the threefold obligation of chastity, poverty, and obedience, included a fourth, by which they bound themselves, unconditionally, *to go as missionaries to any part of the world to which the Holy Father might please to send them*. From resolves so determined and motives so disinterested, Paul III. could not withhold his sanction, and he accordingly approved the "*Society*

of Jesus"[1] in a bull dated September 27, 1540. The number of "professed" members to be admitted into the Society was at first limited to sixty; but learning the beneficial results of their early labours, Paul III. removed the restriction, March 14, 1543, and his successors granted them many and important privileges. The Society spread rapidly in Europe. *Peter Canisius*,[2] in Germany, became one of its members in 1543. Its spirit of charity and ardent zeal were carried beyond the seas by *Francis Xavier*.

The *Constitution of the Society*, more detailed, precise, and rigorous, than that of any of the older orders,[3] may be given in outline as follows: The specific aim of the Society is expressed in its motto "*Ad majoram Dei gloriam*" *To God's greater glory*. Hence it is the duty of the members to labour for the salvation of others as well as their own. *The former* object they accomplish by conducting the spiritual exercises for priests in retreat, preaching missions to the laity, teaching catechism, hearing confessions, defending the faith against heretics, and, more than all, by instructing the youth in *grammar-schools* and *colleges; the latter*, by interior prayer, examen of conscience, the reading of ascetical works, and frequent communion. To be received into the Society the applicants must be of sound body and well endowed with mental gifts.

Novices, after a short trial as postulants, spend *two* years in the *novitiate*, during which *all* studies are suspended, and nearly the whole time is passed in spiritual exercises, in order that, having gone through the various degrees of humility, they may be well prepared for a life of earnest study. Having finished the novitiate, they make their first or simple vows (*vota simplicia*), by which they take upon themselves the threefold obligations of poverty, chastity, and obedience, common to all Religious Orders, and formally promise to remain in the Society, and, at some future day, to accept any charge which the General, acting under the Constitution, may assign them. Their poverty consists in this, that they cannot possess, either individually or collectively, property of any kind whatever, and must supply their wants from voluntary donations. But that teachers and students may not be distracted by constant solicitude for the necessaries of

[1] This appellation, which had in the fifteenth century been conferred by Pius II. on an order of chivalry, met with much opposition, and *Sixtus V.* ordered the General, Claudio de Acquaviva, to discontinue it. But before the order could be carried into effect Sixtus died, and the name was formally approved by *Gregory XIV.*, June 28, 1591. See *Genelli*, L. c., p. 190 sq.; also American Cyclopæd., art. *Jesuits*, by Rev. *B. O'Reilly*, S.J.

[2] *Riess*, S.J., Life of Blessed Peter Canisius, of the Society of Jesus. Freiburg, in Brisgovia, 1865.

[3] The Code of the Society comprises the following: 1st. *Examen generale*, containing a series of questions to be answered by applicants for admission; 2nd. *Constitutiones*, describing the mode of community-life; 3rd. *Regulæ*, relating to the administration of the offices of the Society; 4th. *Declarationes*, or explanations of the text. The whole forms what is known as the *Institutum Societatis Jesu*, which, according to the declaration forming a sequel to the Constitution of 1558, was written by *St. Ignatius* himself and not by Lainez.

life, *colleges* are allowed to receive endowments. At the close of the novitiate, studies begin, consisting chiefly of the *languages*, *poetry*, *rhetoric*, *philosophy*, *mathematics*, and the *physical sciences;* and lasting through a period of five years. After a satisfactory examination, the young Jesuits are set to teach in the schools of the Society for five or six years. Beginning usually with the lowest, they pass on step by step until they have taught the highest branches. They are next sent to make their studies in *theology*, the course of which lasts four years, or six, if a more thorough acquaintance with the Fathers of the Church be desired. At the close of each half year they are made to stand a rigorous examination, and, when their theological studies are completed, they go up for *priest's Orders*. While engaged in these studies they are obliged to meditate and examine their consciences frequently; to receive Holy Communion every three days, and to renew their vows twice in the year. These devotions and regulations are deemed necessary to keep alive in the heart the spirit of true piety, and the better to enable the scholastics to perform them well the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius (*Exercitia spiritualia*)[1] are put into their hands. The conduct of each member of the Society is watched over by another, and no one is permitted to go from the house to which he is attached without a companion.

When the theological studies have been completed, the *second novitiate* is entered upon, which lasts a year, part of which is given to preaching, teaching catechism, and instructing; but the greater part to meditation and prayer, to the study of the Constitution of the Society, and to the cultivation of the different virtues. Finally, when these various stages of probation have been gone through, those who are judged worthy are admitted to make the second vows, and take their places among either the *Coadjutors* or the *Professed.*

The members of the Society are divided into three classes, according to their talents, their knowledge, and their piety, viz., the *Professed*, the *Spiritual Coadjutors*, and the *Temporal Coadjutors*, or Lay Brothers (*Professi*, *coadjutores spirituales*, *coadjutores temporales*).

1. The *Professed* take, besides the three ordinary monastic vows, a *fourth*, by which they bind themselves to go unreservedly as missionaries wherever the Pope wishes to send them, and *no one but the Pope* can absolve them from their vows. From this class are taken the most important officers of the Society, such as the general, the provincials, professors of theology, and superiors of the various houses belonging to the Order. These establishments are the following:

[1] The exercises were first printed at Rome, and approved by Paul III. in 1548. An attempt at systematizing and explaining them is found in *Bellecii* Medulla asceseos seu exercitia S. P. Ign. accuratiori et menti ejus propriori methodo explanata, ed. *Westhoff*, Monast., 1845, 1848, and in *Manresa*, seu exercitia S. Ignatii, Ratisbon, 1848; *Manrèse*, ou les Exercise spirituelles par S. Ignace Loyola, Brussels, 1854. *Manresa*, or the Spir. Exerc. of St. Ignatius, Baltimore, 1866; and A Spir. Retreat of Eight Days, by the *Right Rev. J. M. David*. ed. *M. J. Spalding*, Bp. of Louisville, ibid., 1864; Woodstock, 1876. A brief and spirited analysis of these exercises has been given us by *Père Ravignan*, De l'Institut des Jesuites (Germ. by *Reiching*, Schaffh., 1844, pp. 11-32).

Houses of Professed, under the government of *Presidents; colleges*, requiring each at least thirteen members, under the government of a *rector; affiliated colleges* or *residences*, under the government of a *superior*, in which fathers of advanced age spend the close of their lives in quiet, or perfect any literary labours they may have in hand; and, finally, *mission houses*, intended to supply help to priests having cure of souls. The general holds his office for life, but the officers of inferior rank are elected every three years.

The *Monita Secreta*,[1] or Secret Instructions, which, it is said, were meant to be reserved solely for the Professed, and with whose odious and monstrous principles the Society has been so persistently and so unjustly assailed, are calumnious and apocryphal productions, published against the Jesuits by their enemies. Another calumny is the interpretation which some have put upon a certain passage in the Constitutions, which, it is claimed, *gives a superior the power to oblige the members to do evil* under certain circumstances. It would seem that no one could attach such a meaning to the words in question without *intentionally misapprehending* their true sense.[2]

2. The *Coadjutors*, who make up the bulk of the Society, are engaged in teaching in the schools and in doing pastoral work. Of these the *Scholastics* (*Scholastici approbati*) are entrusted with the most advanced classes.

3. The *Temporal Coadjutors* (*Coadjutores temporales*), or Lay Brothers, to whom the manual and minor offices of the Society are assigned. In the exterior manner of life there is no distinction between the professed and the coadjutors.

Each province is presided over by a *provincial*, and the whole Society is governed by a *general*, who resides *at Rome*, and enjoys absolute power within the limits of the ancient laws of the Order. To make any change in the Rule requires the consent of the General Congregation. To avoid trouble and intrigues among the members,

[1] *Döller*, The Anti-Jesuit, being a Counterbuff to the Jesuits' Journal, 1817.

[2] The passage referred to (Pars. VI., c. 5) runs as follows: "Visum est nobis in Domino, excepto expresso voto, quo societas summo Pontifici, pro tempore existenti, tenetur, ac tribus aliis essentialibus paupertatis, castitatis et obedientiæ, nullas constitutiones, declarationes vel ordinem ullum vivendi posse obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale inducere, nisi Superior ea in nomine Domini J. Chr. vel in virtute obedientiæ juberet." The title under which the words are found is: "Quod constitutiones peccati obligationem non inducunt." The meaning, it is quite evident, is this: "The four great vows bind at all times under guilt of sin; but the other constitutions and ordinances only when the superior commands, in virtue of Holy Obedience or in the name of Jesus Christ." Compared with the obligations enforced by *other* orders, this seems mild. It should seem that the conditions to be found scattered through the "*Declarationes*" ought to have rendered impossible so senseless and dishonest an interpretation. It is there stated over and over again that the superior is to be obeyed "in omnibus rebus *ubi peccatum non cernitur—ubi definiri non possit aliquod peccati genus;*" and again, "hujusmodi illæ omnes (declarationes) in quibus nullum manifestum est peccatum." Cf. *Riffel*, Suppression of the Order of the Jesuits, Mentz, 1845, p. 217 sq. *Steitz*, The meaning of the mediæval phrase "*obligare ad peccatum*" (to bind under sin), Annuary of Germ. Theol., Vol. IX., Gotha, 1864, p. 148 sq. [*Very Rev. J. A. Corcoran, D.D.*, American Cath. Quart. Review for January, 1876, art. "Jesuits," p. 69 sq. (Tr.)]

the provincials and the other superiors of the houses of the society are appointed by the general. He is advised as to the fitness of the latter by the provincial and three other Jesuits. The superiors of the various houses are required to give an account yearly to the general of the conduct and talents of those under their care. The general has a council of *six assistants*, who are men of long experience and tried virtue. They are elected in the General Congregation, one from each of the six "assistancies" of Germany, France, Spain, Portugal,[1] Italy, and Poland. The general acts under the direction of the assistants, who, in extreme cases, may depose him, but the ordinary deposing power is vested in the General Congregation. To the general is attached an *admonitor*, whose duty it is to comfort him as a friend, to watch over him as a father, and to act as his confessor.

It is no wonder that a society like this, the very perfection of a strongly organized *constitutional monarchy*, of wise legislation and prudent administration, should rise to great power, and exert a marvellous influence upon mankind. This was the necessary result of its perfect organization and the courageous spirit by which its members were animated. And in the midst of their important duties as teachers, and their ceaseless activity in other spheres, they have wonderfully preserved the *integrity* of their Constitutions. Any attempt on the part of the members to depart from the *fundamental teachings* of the Church is resisted with stern severity; while, in matters of opinion, they are allowed the largest freedom, which some of them have at times deplorably abused.

In forming a judgment upon the fourth vow of the Jesuits, and generally upon many other points peculiar to the Society, it will be well to bear in mind that the primary aim of its founders was to assume an attitude *in every way absolutely opposed to whatever was Protestant.* Protestantism assailed the Centre of Unity, and aimed at destroying the papacy. The Jesuits, on this very account, bound themselves indissolubly to the Holy See. Protestants enlarged the bounds of liberty till it became license; the Jesuits bound themselves by their Rule to unconditional obedience, even sacrificing their individual wills to the interests of the Society. Protestants, as their own writers avow, often acted under the impulse of passion, without reflection and without foresight, and were in consequence for a long time unable to unite themselves in any sort of organization; the founders of the Society of Jesus, on the contrary, following the noble inspirations of religion, formed themselves into an organization, which is a marvel of unity, and directed their actions with far-seeing wisdom and consummate prudence.

Elements, usually antagonistic to each other, are here found

[1] The "assistancy" of Portugal was never revived after the suppression of the Order in that country. That of England has been lately created, and that of Poland has been merged into that of Germany. (Tr.)

existing together in harmony. The explanation of the phenomen may be obtained from a consideration of the character of the founders. While *Ignatius* was all aglow with a pure and chivalrous enthusiasm, which to some seemed extravagant, and was consumed with a zeal so ardent and a love so tender for Christ and his Church that he appeared to have no other thought, *Lainez* was a calm, discreet, far-seeing man, gifted with a strong will and a talent for organization, seemingly having been born to govern. To the zeal and strong faith of Ignatius, Lainez added discretion and a knowledge of the objects of belief. The principles of interior life, upon which the Society is based, came from Ignatius; from Lainez, the form and organization through which its aims and purposes are attained.[1] The respective qualities of both these men coalesced from the very outset, the one being the complement of the other, and the same differences of character and talent, and the same harmony of action have been preserved with singular uniformity throughout the history of the Society they founded, and whose energy and activity have been such that it is impossible to trace its fortunes without feelings of the liveliest interest. Great courage, indomitable energy, genuine devotion, consummate prudence, and a clear view of the object to be attained, were necessary to successfully arrest the progress of Protestantism, and these were all embodied in the Society of Jesus.

§ 347. *Labours of the Jesuits.*

Testimonials of Popes, Princes, and Scholars, Clerical and Lay, to the Jesuits, or Temple of Honour to the Society of Jesus, Vienna, 1841.

The summary of facts that follows will serve to give some notion of the marvellous activity displayed by the Jesuits in the interests of the Church. It would seem that Germany, the cradle of Protestantism, had literally lapsed into barbarism. The universities, which were rapidly going to decay, were threatened with utter ruin. Ignorance the most profound pervaded the bulk of the people; and since, to be a good Protestant, it was only necessary to deny certain truths of Catholic doctrine, a decided tendency towards the teachings of the Reformation was soon visible, even in countries like *Austria*, which had been strictly Catholic.[2] Twenty years went by, and not a single priest came forth from the once flourishing University of Vienna. Protestant ministers were everywhere to be seen. *Ferdinand I.*, seeing the condition of affairs, resolved to invite (1551) the Jesuits into his dominions. Of those who were sent to him, *Lejay* and *Canisius*[3] were the most distinguished. The latter gave instructions,

[1] *Genelli* (L. c., pp. 238 and 402 sq.), in comparing these men, and showing the relations of the one to the other, takes a view different from the one given above. His arguments have not convinced us that his view is the correct one.

[2] Emperor Ferdinand II., in his Struggle against the Protestant Estates of Upper Austria (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., pp. 675 sq., 742 sq.; Vol. IV., pp. 13 sq., 168 sq., 219 sq.

[3] *Dorigny, S. J.*, La vie du R. P. Pierre Canisius, fondateur du célèbre collége de Fribourg, Avign., 1829. *Riess*, Blessed Peter Canisius, S. J., Freiburg, 1865.

apparently without intermission; preached often; reorganized the university on a new basis; published a new catechism; prudently administered the affairs of the diocese; and thus, by restoring order, not only stayed the advance of heresy, but also succeeded in bringing back to the Catholic faith the bulk of those who had gone over to Protestantism. The celebrated College of the Jesuits at Freiburg, in Switzerland, is another witness to the zeal and activity of Canisius. He was beatified, November 20, 1864.

For similar reasons the Jesuits went to *Bavaria*.[1] *Lejay* led the advance-guard against Protestantism in that country, and not long after (1549) the department of theology at *Ingolstadt* was handed over to them. *Lejay* explained the Psalms, *Salmeron* the Gospels and St. Paul's Epistles, and *Canisius* taught dogmatic theology.[2] In 1559 the Jesuits were invited to Munich. Here their great aim was to revive a taste for classical and general literature and the sciences. Protestants had proscribed the teaching of these on the ground that they savoured too much of the world, were useless in themselves, and positively harmful to a truly religious education; but the Catholic Church had learned from costly experience that the absence of high culture in her most devoted champions had been seriously detrimental to her interests. From this time forth the assaults of the enemies of the Church in Bavaria were ably repulsed.

During this season of comparative peace the Jesuits founded colleges at *Cologne* (1556), at *Treves* (1561), at *Mentz* (1562), at *Augsburg* and *Dillengen* (1563), at *Ellwangen* and *Paderborn* (1585), at *Wuerzburg* (1586), at *Aschaffenburg, Münster*, and *Salzburg* (1588), at *Bamberg* (1595), at *Anvers, Prague*, and *Posen* (1571), and at *Constance* (1604), besides many in other countries. They were everywhere the stay and bulwark of the Church. Their works on theology, philosophy, and philology were of great merit and widely known. Such were the *De particulis linguæ Latinæ*, by *Turselkin;* the *De idiotismis linguæ Græcæ*, a work on grammar, by *Viger;*[3] the *Progymnasmata*, or Exercises in Latin Composition, by *Pontanus;* works on the purity of the Latin language, by *Perpinianus* († 1566), *Vernulaeus*, and others;[4] on poetry, by *James Balde*, the Horace of Germany, by *Sarbiewski, Juvenci, Vanière, Spee*, and *Avancini;*[5] on mathematics and

[1] Conf., § 318.

[2] *Winter*, Hist. of the Evangelical Doctrine in Bavaria, Vol. II., p. 167.

[3] *Hand*, the philologist of Jena, published a new edition of *Turselin's* Particulæ, and *Gottfried Hermann*, of Leipsig, a revised edition of *Viger's* Idiotismi, both of which are highly esteemed.

[4] *Joan. Perpiniani*, Lusitani Opp. Rom., 1749, 4 T. Special praise is bestowed on his eighteen speeches, delivered at Rome, Lyons, and Paris. The most remarkable of them are: De Societatis Jesu gymnasiis; de perfecta doctoris christiani forma; de Deo Trino et Uno; de retinenda veteri religione ad Lug. dunenses et Parisienses. *Ruhnken*, in his ed. of the works of Muret, says "that Perpinian would have disputed the palm of eloquence with Muret, if he had not been cut short in the midst of his career." *Vernulaeus*, elogia oratoria on the heroes of the Thirty Years' War; volumen singulare orationum sacrarum. Conf. *Goettlingii*, Commentatio de Nic. Vernulæo, *Schilleri*, Antecessore in tragœdiis Viraginis Aurelian. et Wallenstenii, Jen., 1862.

[5] Parnassus S. J., i. e., pœmata Patrum S.J., Frcf., 1654, 2 T., 4to.

astronomy, by *Clavius*, *Hell*, *Scheiner*, *Schall*, *De Bell*, and *Poczobut* at *Wilna*; on natural history, by *Kircher*, *Nieremberg*, and *Raczynski*; on geography, by *Acunha*, *Charlevoix*, *Dobrizhofer*, and *Gerbillon*; and on the science of politics, by *Aquaviva*, *Mariana*, *Ribadeneira*, and *Contzen*.[1]

That the method of teaching followed by the Jesuits, who cultivate both intellect and heart by allying science with religion, and stimulate a generous rivalry by various ingenious expedients, is admirably adapted to the education of youth, has been at all times confessed by those best capable of judging.[2] *Speculative theology* and *higher philosophy* had also their exponents in the Society. The names of *Suarez*, *Toletus*, *Ripalda*, and *Petavius* are familiar to every student. It is, however, its special distinction that it has at all times upheld and exemplified in its members a high standard of morality. The example of St. Ignatius had a powerful influence upon his followers. In Italy and at Rome he laboured successfully for the correction of the morals of the people. He opened houses of refuge, under the direction of the *Society of St. Martha*, for fallen but repentant females, and established the Convent of St. Catharine for those whose chastity was in peril. So completely did the Jesuits reform the easy morals and sinful luxury of the Portuguese, that an eye-witness, speaking of the change they had wrought, said: "They wish to found another Sparta." It was only natural that a general desire should be expressed to have bishops appointed from a body of men so conspicuous for intellectual activity and moral probity; but Ignatius († July 31, 1556) refused his consent, because he felt that the possession of so considerable a dignity would be inconsistent with the poverty and humility professed by his followers, and that the fact of such honours being open to them might foster ambition and otherwise do harm to a society whose members were to be, above all things, soldiers of Christ, ready at all times to go where God might call. This extreme rigour was somewhat relaxed under *Lainez* (1558-1565), the second general of the Society, but again strictly enforced by his successor, *Francis Borgia* (1566-1572), the great-grandson of Alexander VI., to whose life that of the illustrious Jesuit formed so marked and redeeming a contrast. It is not surprising to find men so distinguished for virtue and learning soon called to preach at courts, and to be the spiritual guides of princes and those about their persons. Experience had shown that princes, whether for good or ill, according to their dispositions, had greatly influenced the destinies of the Church. Still

[1] *Smets*, What has the Order of the Jesuits done for Science? Aix-la-Chapelle, 1834. *De Backer*, Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus, Liége, 1854 (deuzième série). *George Westermayer*, James Balde, his Life and his works, Munich, 1868. Memorial of the Second Centennial, or Select Poems of James Balde, transl. by *Schrott* and *Schleich*, Munich, 1870. Complete Latin ed. of the Carmina lyrica Jac. Balde, ed. *Hipler*, Monast., 1856; likewise in Lps., and by *Sarbiewski*.

[2] The Jesuits and their Colleges (Cath. Eccl. Journal of *Passau*, 1842). *Karl*, The Old and the New Course of Studies, Mentz, 1846. *Kleutgen*, The Theology of Antiquity, Münster, 1853 sq., 3 vols.

it will ever remain a source of regret to Catholics that some of these good men allowed themselves to be drawn into the meshes of State diplomacy. In one of his circular letters, addressed to the members of the Society, Francis Borgia expressed his pain that some of them should have become mixed up in political affairs. He also chided those who had given themselves too exclusively to purely scientific studies. "You have put aside," said he, "the pride that aspires to ecclesiastical dignities, and you have done well; but you are ambitious to write great works, and thus gratify it by other means. As lambs have we entered, but we rule as wolves; we shall be cast out as dogs, but as eagles shall we be renewed." A similar spirit animated *Everard Mercurian*, a native of Luxemburg, while presiding over the Society (1573-1580).

The curriculum of studies (*ratio studiorum*) and the system of pedagogics followed by the Jesuits were drawn up and received their final form from *Claudius Aquaviva*, the fifth general (1581-1615).[1]

§ 348. *The other Orders.*

Holstenius-Brockie, Codex regularum monasticarum. The works of *Hélyot*, *Biedenfeld*, *Henrion-Fehr*. See Vol. I., p. 524.

It has been frequently and justly remarked that the *degeneracy of the clergy, and their neglect to instruct the people in their religious duties*, thus bringing upon the latter innumerable *corporal and spiritual evils*, had prepared the way for the introduction of Protestantism. The various religious communities now set themselves to remedy this condition of affairs, and began to emulate each other in the zeal with which they instructed the people. But, if this work was to be properly done, it was plainly the duty of the clergy to begin by reforming themselves. This was the motive that occasioned the founding of the following orders:

1. The *Capuchins*. It was the special aim of the Order to root out the love of wealth, and generally to banish the spirit of worldliness that in many places had crept into the older monasteries and convents. To effect this purpose they practised in their own persons the most rigorous poverty, the most austere self-denial, and the most profound humility, thus making themselves patterns of virtue to the world, stimulating men to strive after a higher standard of excellence, and, above all, fitting themselves to render efficient service to priests

[1] The following were generals of the Society: *Mutio Vitelleschi*, Nov. 15, 1615—Febr. 9, 1645; *Vincent Caraffa*, Jan. 7, 1646—June 8, 1649: *Francis Piccolomini*, Dec. 13, 1649—June 17, 1651; *Alexander Gotfredi*, Jan. 21, 1652—March 12, same year; *Goswin Nickel*, March 17, 1655—1664; *John Paul Oliva*, Vicar-General of the Order, cum spe succedendi, 1664—1681; *Charles de Noyelle*, 1682—Dec. 12, 1686; *Gonzales de Santalla*, July 6, 1687—Oct. 27, 1705; *Michael Angelo Tamburini*, Jan. 30, 1706—1730; *Francis Retz*, 1730—1750; *Ignatius Visconti*, 1751; *Aloysius Centurione*, 1755; *Lawrence Ricci*, May 21, 1758—1773. Cf. Imagines Præpositorum Generalium soc. Jesu delineatæ, et æreis formis expressæ ab Arnoldo van Westerhout, addita brevi unius cujusque vitæ descriptione a P. Nicol. *Galeotti* ed. II., Rom. 1751; on the generals in particular, see *Buss*, p. 641 sq.

burdened with the weighty and responsible care of souls. The Capuchins were only a branch of the great Franciscan Order, and their mode of life a modification of its Rule. Among the Franciscans the severity of their Rule had early become a subject of discussion, which finally led to a secession of some of the members, of whom *Matteo de' Bassi*, of the convent of Montefalcone, was the leading spirit. These were rigorists who desired to restore the primitive austerities of the Order. They began by a change of dress, adding to the usual monastic habit a "*cappuccio*," or pointed hood, which Matteo claimed was of the same pattern as that worn by St. Francis. By the bull *Religionis zelus* (1528), Matteo obtained from Pope *Clement VII.* leave for himself and his companions to wear this peculiar dress; to allow their beards to grow; to live in hermitages, according to the rule of St. Francis, and to devote themselves chiefly to the reclaiming of great sinners.[1] *Paul III.* afterwards gave them permission to settle wheresoever they liked. Consistently with the austerity of their professions, their churches were unadorned, and their convents built in the simplest style. They became very serviceable to the Church, and their fearlessness and assiduity in waiting upon the sick during a plague, which ravaged the whole of Italy, made them extremely popular. The progress of these reformed Hermits[2] received a rude shock from the conduct of *Ochino*, their third *Vicar-General*, who, after having become eminent as an earnest preacher, led a young girl astray, went over to Protestantism (1542), and was shortly after married at Geneva. The punishment of his misconduct was visited upon his brethren, who for two years were forbidden to preach. They, however, soon regained their merited consideration, and did excellent service in the cause of the Church. They were peculiarly adapted to the needs of the age, spread rapidly, and their popularity was such that many persons of distinction enrolled themselves among them. Of those it will be sufficient to instance *Alphonsus d'Este, Duke of Modena; Henry, Duke of Joyeuse;* and *Joseph le Clerc du Tremblay.*

2. The *Theatines.* About the year 1524 a number of Italian prelates formed an association for serving the sick, and thus gaining souls to Christ. The scope of the association was gradually widened, so as to include *the correction of the manners of the clergy*,[3] their advancement in learning, and the fostering of a spirit of self-denial, to the end that they might be able to go through the functions of their office with dignified decorum, and exclude from their sermons every

Bolland, M. Maj. T. IV., p. 233. *Boverio*, Ann. ord. Minor. qu[i] Capucini nuncupantur. Lugd. Bat., 1632 sq., 3 T., f. M. a. *Tugio.*, Bullar. ord. Capu[ci]nor. Rom., 1740 sq., 7 T., f. *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 24, p. 192 sq.

[2] Their real name was "*Hermits Friars Minor*," but the people gave them the name of "*Cappuccini*," an endearing diminutive from *Cappuccio;* hence their later appellation "Capuchins." (Tr.)

[3] Clementis VII. approbatio, etc., in *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 12, p. 84 sq. Bullar. Rom., T. I., p. 659. *Holstenius-Brockie*, T. V., p. 342 sq. Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. X., p. 831 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 23, p. 274 sq.

coarse and unbecoming expression. To prepare for death those condemned to capital punishment the Theatines regarded as their peculiar charge. *Gaetano di Tiene*, a Venetian, appears to have been the real founder of this association. Going to Rome by advice of his confessor, he won over to his views *John Peter Caraffa*, then Archbishop of Chieti (Latin, Theate), and prevailed upon him to become superior of the new Order. Elected Pope some time later, under the name of *Paul IV.*, Caraffa gave to the members of the Order, which had been approved some time before by *Clement VII.*, as the "*Canons Regular of the Lateran Congregation*," the name of *Theatines*. As preachers and missionaries, the Theatines became a pattern to the rest of the clergy. By their vow of poverty, they were forbidden to possess property; were to subsist entirely upon the alms of the faithful, and were strictly inhibited from begging or in any way soliciting contributions.

3. The *Somaschans*. This congregation of regular clergy received its name from the little town of *Somascha*, in the Milanese territory. It was founded, in 1528, by *St. Jerome Emilian*,[1] the son of a Venetian senator. It was approved, in 1540, by Paul III., received many privileges from Pius IV., and raised to the rank of a monastic Order by Pius V. in 1568. By their Rule, the members were bound to the observance of a life of austerity; to unceasing prayer, protracted through the night; to the instruction of the inhabitants of the rural districts; and, particularly, to the care of orphans. Their schools at Rome, Pavia, and other cities of Italy were of unusual excellence.

4. The *Barnabites*. This was also a congregation of regular clergy. They are so called from the church of St. Barnabas at Milan, where they came together, like the early Christians, to live a life in common, and devote themselves to the office of teaching. The founders of the Barnabites (1530) were three gentlemen, viz., *Anthony Maria Zaccaria*, of Cremona; *Bartholomew Ferrera* and *James Anthony Morigia*, of Milan. The congregation was approved by Clement VII. in 1532, and in 1535 its members were permitted to take solemn vows by *Paul III.* From this time forth it took rank as an Order, having a general, who held office for three years, but might be re-elected.[2] Its work was chiefly confined to giving *missions* in Christian countries; to the *instruction of youth*, and the direction of *seminaries*. Some of the Barnabites were appointed to professorships at Milan, Pavia, and other Italian cities.

5. The *Oblates*, or Volunteers, established by *St. Charles Borromeo* in 1578, are a congregation of secular priests, somewhat resembling the two preceding Orders. Their special aim was to give edification to the diocese, and to maintain the integrity of religion by the purity

[1] Vita Hieronymi Æmiliani (*Bolland.*, Acta SS. mensis Febr., T. II.) *Holsten.*, T. III., p. 199 sq. *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 33, p. 263 sq.

[2] Bullar. Rom., T. I., p. 689. *Holsten.*, T. V., p. 449 sq. *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 15. p. 119 sq.

of their lives, by teaching, and by zealously discharging the duties committed to them by their bishop.[1] These devoted ecclesiastics were very much loved by St. Charles, who was wont to call them his *children*, and was never so happy as when among them. Strange to say, they do not seem to have been much appreciated elsewhere.

6. The *Oratorians* were founded by *Philip Neri*, a Florentine.[2] Philip, after going through his academical studies with distinction, went to reside at Rome, where he devoted himself to instructing the youth and serving the sick in the hospitals. In 1548 he founded the Confraternity of the Most Holy Trinity, which grew so rapidly in public favour that Philip was enabled solely by voluntary contributions to build a hospital for poor pilgrims. The Oratory (*Oratorium*) in which the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers were read and explained to the pilgrims, being much too small to accommodate the throngs that came there, Pope Paul IV., in 1558, put a church sufficiently large at the disposal of Philip. The Congregation approved in 1574 by Gregory XIII., under the name of the "*Congregation of the Oratory*," was at first composed of both ecclesiastics and laymen, *who, however, took no distinctive vows.* It was Philip's idea to found a Congregation in which such as did not feel themselves called to enter any of the established Orders, might enjoy all their benefits without assuming their obligations. Although the avowed aim of the Congregation was the instruction of the people, its members from the very beginning gave themselves up to deep and serious study. Many of them, like *Baronius*, *Odéric Raynald*, *Galla nio*, and *Andrew Gallandi*, became eminent in literature. Philip was canonized by Pope Gregory XV. in 1622.

Following the example of St. Philip Neri, the great statesman, Abbé *Bérulle*[3] (created cardinal in 1627), together with four other priests, established (1611) *in France the Oratory of Jesus*, for the purpose of reforming the French clergy. The Oratory was approved in 1613 by Paul V. The members were divided into the *incorporated* and *associated*, neither taking vows of any kind. Their number increased rapidly, and included many distinguished scholars and preachers. Of these, *Malebranche*, *Morin*, *Thomassin*, *Richard Simon*, *Bernard Lamy*, *Houbigant*, *Lelong*, and *Massillon* are the best known.

7. The *Congregation of St. Maur.* The Order of St. Benedict, once so active and prosperous, became lax and infected with the spirit of the world in France as in other countries. In the midst of abundance it had grown poor. After many vain efforts at reform by

1 Cf. *Dieringer*, St. Charles Borromeo, p. 371 sq.

2 *Gallonius*, Vita Phil. Nerii, Mogunt., 1602. *Poesl*, Life of St. Philip Neri, Ratisbon, 1857. *Faber*, Life of St. Philip Neri, Germ. tr., Ratisbon, 1859. *Hélyot*, Vol. VIII., ch. 10. *Holsten.*, T. VI., p. 234 sq. and p. 529 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XXII. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. VII., pp. 506-515; Fr. tr., s. v. *Neri*, Vol. 16, p. 56 sq.

3 *Habert de Cerisi*, Vie de Pierre de Berulle, Paris, 1646, 4to. *Tabaraud*, Histoire de Pierre de Berulle, Paris, 1817, 2 vols., 8vo. Cf. *Henrion-Fehr.*, Vol. II., pp. 249-254.

+**Herbst*, Literary Services of the French Oratory (Tübing. Quart., year 1835, nro. 3), an Essay, which has unfortunately remained unfinished.

others, *Didier de la Cour*,[1] Prior of the Abbey of St. Vannes, at Verdun in Lorraine, undertook and successfully accomplished the work. Set over this abbey while still young, he entered upon and closely pursued a severe course of studies by way of preparation for a still more thorough course at some university. Returning full of zeal, after having accomplished his purpose, from the University of Pont-à-Mousson, he resolved to exert all his influence in an effort to have his brethren apply themselves to sacred studies as a step towards a necessary reform. When he had succeeded in introducing a strict observance into his own Abbey of *St. Vannes* and that of *St. Hidulph*, he also prevailed, but with some difficulty, upon the community of the Abbey of *Moyen-Moutier* to accept the reform, and the three restored the primitive severity of the Rule of St. Benedict. The Reform was at first regarded with some suspicion, but after its approval by Clement VIII., in 1604, it met with more favour, and was introduced into many of the Benedictine monasteries. In 1618, at a General Chapter, held in the Convent of *St. Mansuy*, at Tulle, it was resolved to unite the *reformed houses* together in a distinct Congregation, under the patronage of *St. Maur*, *St. Benedict's* greatest disciple. This *Congregation* received the authorisation of Gregory XV., and *Richelieu* did what he could to promote its success. It soon included one hundred and eighty abbeys and conventual priories. Besides the Rule of St. Benedict, it had certain statutes peculiar to itself, and was presided over by a general, who resided in the Cloister of *St. Germain-des-Prés*, at Paris. The spirit and efficiency of the new Order were manifest in its ability in directing ecclesiastical seminaries, but, above all, in the number of distinguished scholars it produced. Among them are names eminent in palæography and chronology, in civil and ecclesiastical history, but notably in patrology. It will be sufficient to mention those of *Mabillon*, *Montfaucon*, *Ruinart*, *Thuillier*, *Martène*, *Durand*, *Ménard*, *D'Achéry*, *Le Nourry*, *Martianay*, *Massuet*, *Touttée*, *Maran*, *Coustant*, *Dela Rue*, *Garnier*, *Aubert*, *Clémencet*, *Ceillier*, *Rivière*, and others, whose patristic labours and works on Church History have gained for them an undying fame.

8. The *Carmelites*. *St. Teresa*, whose *religious* life had been spent under the Carmelite Rule, as modified by Eugene IV., brought about a complete reform in the Order. Born at Avila, in Old Castile, in 1515, she was the daughter of Alfonso, of the noble House of Sanchez de Cayeda, and, as a child, was remarkable for extraordinary piety. Called by God to lead souls along the way to perfection, she learned by her own experience the weakness and instability of the human

[1] (*Haudiquer*), Hist. du vén. Dom Didier de la Cour, réformateur des Ben., Par., 1772. (*Tassin*), Hist. lit. de la congr. de St. Maur, Par., 1726, 4to; Brux., 1770, 4to, with observations by Meusel, Frkf. and Lps., 1773, 2 vols. Cf. †*Herbst*, The Services of the Congr. of St. Maur rendered to the cause of science, Tübg. Theol. Review, 1833, nro. 1 sq. See *Helyot*, Vol. VI., ch. 35, p. 318 sq.; ch. 37, p. 335 sq. *Henrion-Fehr*, I. 187-193. *Chavin de Malan*, Hist. de D. Mabillon et de la congrégation de St. Maur, Paris, 1843 (hasty).

heart. After a long and violent struggle between a vivid consciousness of duty and the sluggish performance of it, between love of God and attachment to the world, she finally shook off the bonds that had bound her to earth, and gave herself generously to God. The conflict she passed through during this season of trial is told with simple and unaffected frankness in the story of her life. The sensitive delicacy of her feelings, and the workings of her luminous intellect, are there portrayed with wonderful vividness. Her teaching, as set forth in her *writings*,[1] has served as a light to guide numberless souls to perfection, and, in the office of her feast, is dignified by the Church with the title of *celestial*. She went to her reward in the year 1582, seemingly more consumed by a yearning to be with her God than wasted by the ravages of disease. With the consent and approbation of Pius IV., Teresa set to work, in 1562, to reform the convents of women belonging to the Order of Mount Carmel. She was opposed from the very outset; but strong in the strength of God, she overbore all obstacles, and in the end her efforts were wholly successful. From convents of women, the reform extended to convents of men, where it was still more obstinately opposed. Her final success was mainly due to the efforts of *St. John of the Cross*,[2] whose *mystical writings* are, if anything, more remarkable than those of St. Teresa herself. Her disciples, the *Discalced Carmelites*, both male and female, have been distinguished by their disinterested devotion to works of charity, and by their zeal in fostering and promoting a love of a contemplative life. Since her death, her reform has been introduced into every Catholic country.

9. The *Order of the Visitation*. This, like the preceding Order, was founded by the joint efforts of two devout souls, viz., *St. Francis de Sales*[3] and Madame *Frances de Chantal*.[4] St. Francis was born at the family Castle of Sales, near Annecy, in Savoy, August 21, 1567,

[1] These have been translated into French, Polish, German, and other European languages. The works of St. Teresa of Jesus have been edited by *G. Schwab*, Sulzbach, 1831-1833, 5 vols. Selections from her Writings, by *Fred. Schlosser*, Frankfort, 1827-1832. *Jocham*, An Abridgment of the Writings of St. Teresa, Ratisbon, 1863. On the reform of St. Teresa, cf. *Hélyot*, Vol. I., ch. 48, p. 425 sq. The best account of her life is to be found in the continuation of the *Acta Sanctorum*, by the Bollandist Fathers, Vol. VII., for October. †*Hennes*, Life of St. Teresa, 2nd ed., Mentz, 1866. *Bouix, S. J.*, Life of St. Teresa, tr. from the French into German, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1868.

[2] Complete works, tr. into German by *Schwab*, Sulzbach, 1830, 2 pts., 2nd ed., by *Jocham*, Sulzbach, 1858.

[3] *Œuvres* de Saint François de Sales, Paris, 1834, 16 vols.; Paris, 1836, 4 vols., 4to; Paris (L. Vivès 5th ed.), 1869-1874, 12 vols., 8vo. His Life, by *Chas. Aug. de Sales*, 1634; Marsollier, 1747; 5th ed., Paris, 1870, 2 vols. *Boulanger*, Studies on St. Francis of Sales, trans. from the French into German, Munich, 1861, 2 vols. *Bougard*, Vie de St. François de Sales; Germ. by *Lager*, Ratisb., 1871, 2 vols. His most influential works were: *Lettres à divers gens du Monde;* but particularly his *Philothea*, which has been honoured with countless translations; Spirit of St. Francis of Sales, gathered from his writings; Theotimus, &c.

[4] *Louis Clarus*, Life of St. Jeanne Frances de Chantal, Schaffh., 1861. *Daurignac*, St. Jeanne Franc. de Chantal, &c., Paris, 1858 (Germ., Ratisbon, 1860); 2nd ed., 1867; by *Clarus*, Hildesheim, 1870.

and having studied at the provincial colleges of La Roche and Annecy, went to Paris (1578), where he completed his course of rhetoric and philosophy under the Jesuits. In 1584, he went to the University of Padua to study canon and civil law, and completed his course, in 1591, with great distinction. While there he put himself under the spiritual direction of Father *Possevin*, a Jesuit, who being truly a man of God, spoke to the young student of the wounds of the Church, which, he said, were in all cases traceable to the corruption of the clergy. On his return home, he learned that his father had obtained for him a place in the senate, and arranged a very honourable and advantageous marriage; but these he declined, having made up his mind to take Orders, and give himself wholly to the service of God. As a priest his virtues and his piety were such that he was soon called to be coadjutor bishop of the diocese of *Geneva*, to which he succeeded on the death of Mgr. Granier, in 1602. His eloquence, which was convincing and *popular*, brought many heretics back to the Church, and his *writings*, graceful, original, and *breathing a spirit of love and tenderness*, have continued to our own day to guide many faithful souls in the ways of piety.

The *congregation of women*, founded by him, conjointly with Madame de Chantal, at Annecy, in 1610, was not at first strictly bound to observe the rules of religious bodies living in common, the chief aim of the good ladies being primarily to serve the sick. Some time later, St. Francis enjoined upon them the observance of the *Rule of St. Augustine*, to which he added some particular constitutions of his own; and, in 1618, Paul V. raised the congregation to the rank of a religious Order, under the title of the *Order of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin*. To their original purpose, that of educating the youth of their own sex was now added.[1] Before Francis closed his eyes in death he had the gratification of seeing eighty-seven houses of his Order established in France and Savoy alone, and since that time they have become numerous in Italy, Germany, Poland, and North America.

10. The *Ursulines*[2] were at first an association of pious ladies formed at Brescia about the year 1537, by *Angela de' Merici*, a native of *Desenzano*, a town on Lake Garda. This angelic soul, who is better known as Angela of Brescia, found her only joy in communing with God, forgetting self, and ministering to the wants of others. In this spirit of self-denial, she gathered about her a few ladies as unselfish and generous as herself, and placing the little band under the patronage of St. Ursula (November 25, 1535), began the work of reclaiming unfortunate women. The members of the Association, while tending the sick, relieving the poor, instructing young girls, and doing other works of charity, continued to reside in the homes

[1] *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 43.

[2] *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 20-32. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., pp. 68-72. Biographies of the foundress: "The Life of St. Angela of Merici," Augsburg, 1811; by *Sintzel*, Ratisbon, 1842. *Saint-Foix*, Annales de l'ordre de St. Ursule, Clermont-Ferrand, 1858, 2 vols.

of their parents or relatives. After the death of the foundress, January 27, 1540, the Association soon grew to be an Order, and was approved June 9, 1544, by Paul III., who also gave the members leave to make such changes in their Rule as circumstances might require. The leading object of the Order was now the *education of young ladies*. The organization of the Ursulines being still further perfected by *St. Charles Borromeo*, their special patron, was again approved by Gregory XIII. From Upper Italy the Order spread to France, where it was introduced by the accomplished widow, *Madeleine de St. Beuve*. She established a Mother House in Paris, to which many affiliated convents were soon attached. Their Rule, drawn up by Father Gontery, assisted by other Jesuits, and approved by *Paul V.*, for the use of the Congregation Regular of Ursulines (1612), was based upon the Rule of St. Augustine, but, in its present form, embraces, besides twenty-five chapters of "*Admonitions*" and eleven "*Legacies*," so called because they were drawn from the posthumous writings of St. Angela of Brescia. From this time forth the education of young girls of every age from childhood up was almost wholly in their hands, and their presence was hailed with joy in every country of Christendom.

An association of "*Young English Ladies*," founded by Miss *Mary Ward*,[1] the daughter of an English nobleman, who had continued loyal to the Catholic Church, had a similar object in view. She died in 1645.

11. The *Fathers of the Christian Doctrine*. The aim of this congregation, and the spirit with which it was animated, were in close sympathy with the spirit and aim of the Ursulines. Founded by *Cæsar de Bus*, and approved by Clement VIII. in 1597, it subsequently coalesced with the *Somaschans*, thus forming an association of secular priests living under simple vows (1616). Owing, however, to disputes between the two branches, relative to the observance of their respective statutes (1647), Innocent X. commanded them to sever their connection with each other, and form distinct congregations; and Alexander VII., by decree, ordered both to establish novitiates, and to introduce the three monastic vows. The *Fathers of the Christian Doctrine* continued to dress as secular priests.

Other religious congregations of both men and women, having nearly, if not quite the same object and scope, were established in France and elsewhere. Such were the *Brothers of the Christian Schools*, founded by *John Baptist de la Salle*, a canon of Rheims (1651-1714), and approved by Benedict XIII.;[2] and the *Sisters of the Schools of the Infant Jesus* and the *Daughters of Providence*, both of which were united

[1] The Life, Labours, and Portrait of *Mary Ward*, Augsburg, 1840. *Leitner*, Hist. of the Young English Ladies and their Establishments down to our own Day, Ratisbon, 1869. **Schels*, Modern Religious Associations of Women, Schaffh., 1858, pp. 80-147. Cf. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., pp. 38-41.

[2] *Hélyot*, Vol. VIII., ch. 30. The Brothers of the Christian Schools, established by John B. de la Salle; their Constitution, Organization, and Rule, Germ. tr., Augsburg, 1844. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., p. 292 sq.

into one congregation, in 1681, by *Nicholas Barré*, a Franciscan, who also established normal schools for training teachers. These bound themselves to teach gratuitously, and their appointments depended upon the discretion of their superiors.[1] Such also were the associations founded by *Mark de Sadis Cusani*, in 1652, and by *John Leonardi* at Lucca, in 1570.

12. The *Piarists*, or Brethren of the Pious Schools (*Piarum scholarum Patres*), in zeal the rivals of the Jesuits, were founded by a Spanish priest, *Joseph Calasanze* († 1648), for the education of youth.[2] Having resigned his office of vicar-general to the Bishop of Urgel, Calasanze visited Rome, where he led an austere and exemplary life, and attracted attention by his zeal in providing, during a protracted season of epidemic, for the temporal and spiritual wants of the afflicted. His efforts in behalf of destitute orphans were also unceasing and efficient. With the approbation of Pope Clement VIII., he associated with himself, in the year 1600, a number of secular priests for the education of youth. They were approved as a religious congregation by Paul V., and by Gregory XV., in the year 1621, as an Order (*Ordo Patrum Piarum Scholarum*). Their special mission was to educate the young in the arts and sciences; but, above all, to train them to habits of holy living. They soon extended the field of their labours, and their establishments were numerous in Austria, Poland, and other European countries. After the suppression of the Jesuits, their functions as teachers were in a great measure supplied by the Piarists.

13. The *Brothers of Charity* were founded, in 1540, at Seville, in Spain, by the Portuguese, *John of God*. Born in 1495, John led a roving life until his forty-fifth year, when he was converted at Grenada by an impressive sermon of John Avila's, and from thenceforth (1540) he gave himself entirely to the service of the sick in the hospitals. The Archbishop of Grenada and the Bishop of Tuy, admiring his efforts to copy in his life the broad charity and tender mercy of our Saviour, entered warmly into his plans, surnaming him "*John of God*." He died in 1550, poor in the wealth of this world, but rich in good works. His companions, who continued to carry on his work, bound themselves still more closely to each other, by taking upon them the three monastic vows, with the additional obligation of gratuitously serving the sick in the hospitals. They received recognition as an Order, under the name of the *Brethren of St. John of God*, in 1617, from Pope Paul V.,[3] and have since continued to render important services within their sphere in every Catholic country. In the hospitals, to each of which only *one priest* was attached, they

[1] *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., p. 291.

[2] *Holstenius-Brockie*, T. VI., p. 439 sq. *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 39, p. 331 sq. Cf. Life and Miracles of *Jos. Calasanze*, tr. from the Italian into German, Vienna, 1748.

[3] *Holsten.-Brockie*, T. VI., p. 264 sq. *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 18, p. 156 sq. *Wilmot*, Life of St. John of God, tr. fr. the Fr. into Germ., Ratisbon, 1862. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. II., p. 175 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 12, p. 133 sq.

were as ready to serve *non-Catholics* as those of their own faith, their Constitution obliging them to make no distinction of faith, rank, or nation. Their founder was beatified in 1630 by Urban VIII., and canonized by Alexander VIII. in 1690.

14. The *Priests of the Missions*, or the *Lazarists*,[1] whose scope included in part that of every congregation previously established, have not unfrequently done very essential service to Christianity. Their founder, *St. Vincent de Paul* (*Vincentius a Paulo*—not *a Paula*), was born of humble but pious parents, in the village of Pouy, in the diocese of Acqs, at the foot of the Pyrenees, in 1576. In his youth he tended his father's flocks, but his parents, judging correctly that one of such excellent parts, both of intellect and heart, was fitted by nature for some higher calling, sent him, in 1588, to a Franciscan convent to be educated. While there he made the best of his opportunities, and feeling himself called to the priesthood,[2] went to perfect his studies at the University of Toulouse, where, after spending some years, he was ordained priest in 1600. He shortly after became head-master of a school at Buzet, which acquired quite a reputation for the thoroughness and efficiency of its pupils. But his many and varied occupations did not hinder him from applying himself to serious study, and in 1604 he received the degree of bachelor of theology. In the course of a voyage from Marseilles to Narbonne, in 1605, he and his companions fell into the hands of some Barbary corsairs, who sold him into slavery at Tunis. Here he passed successively under the proprietorship of three masters, the third of whom, a Savoyard renegade, he brought back to the Church, and having returned to France, went thence to Rome, and prevailed upon his former master to join the Brothers of Charity in that city. Introduced to Henry IV. by the French ambassador, Vincent, after satisfactorily executing some important commissions, was made almoner to Queen Margaret of Valois. Having too much leisure time on his hands to suit his active zeal, he entered the Oratory, lately established by the Abbé de Bérulle, on whose recommendation he became successively Curé of Clichy, near Paris, and tutor in the family of Count de *Gondi*, commander of the royal galleys. The ardent charity of Vincent never permitted him to be at rest. He alternately employed himself in instructing the children of the count, in edifying the whole family by his exemplary conduct and wise counsels, in prudently watching over the administration of their large estates, in instructing the sick, and catechizing the poor.

[1] *Hélyot*, Vol. VIII., ch. 11. (Sometimes called the *Vincentian Congregation*.) (Tr.)

[2] *Abelly*, Vie de St. Vincent de Paule, instituteur et premier supérieur général de la Congrégation de la Mission, Paris, 1664, in numberless editions (English Life, by *Thompson*); German tr., by *Brentner*, Ratisbon, 1859, 5 vols. *Fred. L. of Stolberg*, Life of St. Vincent de Paul, Münster, 1819. Since then there have appeared in France several biographies of the Saint; the last is that by †*Orsini*, translated into German by *Steck*, Tübing., 1843. The principal one by Abbé *Maynard*, Vie de St. Vincent de Paul, 4 vols., Paris, 1860. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., p. 328 sq.

While in this position, Vincent, after hearing the confession of one, who, without deserving it, enjoyed a reputation for high sanctity, conceived the design of starting what are known as the *Missions of France*, the first experiment of which was made among the tenantry of the pious Countess de Gondi. Appointed to the care of souls at Chatillon, Vincent displayed marvellous energy, and undertook and successfully carried forward projects so vast, that even one of them would seem sufficient to call forth resources and occupy the life of an ordinary man. For instance, he founded the sisterhood known as the *Daughters of Charity*, or *Grey Sisters* (*Filles de la charité, sœurs grises*), to whom he gave a Rule of life, and charged them with the care of the hospitals (1618). Returning again to the family of Gondi, he occupied his time in giving missions, and in doing what he could to soften the hard lot of the galley-slaves, to whom, when his works were made known at the court of *Louis XIII.*, he was appointed almoner-general in 1619.

In 1620, he consented, at the request of his friend, *St. Francis de Sales*, to become spiritual director of the Convent of Visitation nuns at Paris. The project, which he had long had in his mind, of forming a society of *Priests of the Missions*, who, with the consent of the bishop of the diocese and of the pastor of the parish, would preach the Gospel to the peasants of the country, was, in the year 1624, carried into effect. For its realization, he was much indebted to the Gondi family, who contributed liberally themselves, and by their good example brought others to do the same.

In the year 1627, Louis XIII. made munificent donations to help on the work of the Missions in France. In 1632, Urban VIII. approved the object of the congregation, and instructed Vincent to draw up a rule for its guidance. Foreseeing that the work of the Missions could do no permanent good, unless the priests in charge of parishes would zealously continue what had been begun, and fully conscious that as a rule the secular clergy could not be relied on for such persevering efforts, he took counsel with several bishops, who agreed that, in order to bring the clergy to an earnest and abiding sense of their duty, they should be made to undergo rigorous examinations, and to make spiritual retreats and hold *conferences* at the mission-houses.

After the death of the Countess de Gondi, in 1625, Vincent made the acquaintance of *Louise de Marillac*, widow of *M. Le Gras*,[1] a lady equally distinguished for purity of life and extensive learning. After severely testing her vocation for four years, he placed her, in 1629, over all the communities of *Grey Sisters*. The Society of "Priests of the Mission," which he had established at the so-called Priory of St. Lazarus in Paris, whence the name *Lazarists*, was soon widely

[1] The Life and Spirit of the Venerable *Louise de Marillac*, by *Gobillon* (Germ., Augsburg, 1837), (*Clement Brentano*). The Sisters of Charity in their Relations to the Poor and the Sick, Coblentz, 1831. *Eremites* (Buss), The Order of the Sisters of Charity, 1845. *Droste* (Clement Augustus). On the Society of the Sisters of Charity, Münster, 1843.

extended. Besides their mission-labours, they took complete charge, in many instances, of ecclesiastical seminaries, which, in obedience to the instruction of the Council of Trent, had been established in the various dioceses, and even at this day many of these institutions are under their direction. In the year 1642 these devoted priests were to be seen in *Italy*, and not long after were sent to Algiers, to Tunis, to Madagascar, and to Poland. St. Vincent himself, even at the age of seventy-eight, continued to give missions, and was constantly engaged in founding *hospitals*, which he placed under the protection of the Holy Name of Jesus. He also promoted the future welfare of the French clergy by having various *religious associations* hold *conferences* in the Houses of the Missions.[1] The life of Vincent, so active and so crowded with good works, was closed by a holy death on the 27th of September, 1660, when he went to receive the crown of glory laid up for him in heaven. He was canonized by Clement XII. in 1737.

§ 349. *Foreign Missions.*

Fabricii, Lux salutaris, p. 662 sq. *Mamachii*, Antiquit. chr., lib. II., Pt. II., c. 28-31. *Lettres édifiantes* et curieuses, écrites des missions étrangères par quelques Missionnaries de la Compagnie de Jesus, Paris, 1717-1777, 34 vols.; and in particular, Choix de lettres édifiantes, etc., précedé de tableaux géographiques, historiques, politiques, religieux, et litéraires des pays de missions, 3rd edit., Paris, 8 vols. *Hazart*, S. J., Ch. H., i. e. Cath. Christianity propagated throughout the World, Vienna, 1594 sq., 5 vols., fol. †**Wittmann*, Grandeur of the Church in her Missions since the Schism. General Hist. of the Missions during the last three Centuries, Augsburg, 1841 sq. *Henrion*, General Hist. of the Catholic Missions, Paris, 1846-1847, 4 vols. (Vol. II.) †*Marshall*, The Christian Missions. †*Hahn*, Hist. of the Catholic Missions, from Christ to our own day, Cologne, 1857 sq., 5 vols. *Grundemann*, General Missionary Atlas, Gotha, 1867.

True ministers of the Gospel do not confine their charity and devote their lives solely to those nations that have been long loyal to the Christian faith. They also carry their labours and the light of their example among the heathen into lands the most remote and to peoples the most barbarous. Of all the Orders, none has shown such heroic zeal in missionary labours as the *Society of Jesus*. Many of its members had no other ambition, and could have no higher, than to spend their lives for love of Christ, labouring in some far-away mission. The discoveries lately made by the Spaniards and the Portuguese furnished them at once the opportunity and the means of carrying their wishes into effect; and the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (*Congregatio de propaganda fide*),[2] established in Rome in 1622, encouraged these zealous and courageous men in undertaking missionary expeditions, and imparted system and continuity to their

[1] Vincent de Paul and the Manufacturing System of France (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. X.)

[2] Erectio S. Congr. de fide cath. propaganda (Bullar. Rom., T. III., p. 421 sq.) *Fabricii*, Lux salut., p. 566 sq. Constitt. Apostolicæ S. Congr. de prop. fide, Rom., 1642, fol. *Bayeri*, Hist. Congregat. Cardinalium de propaganda fide. Regiom., 1670, 4to. Cf. *Hélyot*, Vol. III., ch. 12, pp. 81-100, on the Various Institutions founded for the Propagation of the Faith.

efforts. This Congregation, composed of fifteen cardinals, three prelates, and a secretary, received the abundant alms contributed for missionary work by the faithful, and distributed them with judgment and regularity. In 1627, Pope Urban VIII., appreciating the need of priests specially trained for the foreign missions, presented the Congregation with the large and commodious building, for a seminary, now known as the *Collegium Urbanum de Propaganda Fide*. The example of the Pope inspired others, and it was not long until munificent donations came pouring in from every side to help on the good work and put it on a secure basis. From every people and clime under the sun came students then, as in our own day, to be educated there for the work of the Apostolate, and by these representatives of every tongue is *the sublime spectacle of the Christian Pentecost annually re-enacted in Rome on the first Sunday after Epiphany*. On this day, the great feast of the Propaganda, the praises of the Triune God are spoken in languages representing every quarter of the world, thus exemplifying and giving expression to the grand idea that lies at the very foundation of the Catholic Church.[1]

In view of the striking resemblance between the mysteries of the Christian religion and the teachings of the *Vedas*, where, for example, Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva stand for the three Persons of the *Trinity*, indicating the manner of the manifestation of the *primordial Being*, and where something very like an *incarnation* is related in connection with Vishnu, it seems strange that the Hindoos should have always opposed the most insuperable difficulties to the introduction of Christianity.[2] But the religious system of India, so closely bound up with the national life, the traditions, and sympathies of the people, could not be expected to give way without a struggle before the advance of the Gospel. Subject for nearly ten centuries to the yoke of the Mussulman, the Indian has clung to his national sanctuaries with a courage that must be admired; and while almost indifferent as to what sort of government he lives under, perseveringly defends his religious notions, and dwells with melancholy enthusiasm upon the departed glories of his people. To triumph over such obstacles required the noble exertions characteristic of the Society of Jesus.

Acting in obedience to the request of John III., King of Portugal, and with the sanction of the Pope, *Francis Xavier*, who, in zeal for the salvation of souls, in reliance on God, in heroic courage, and exhaustless patience, was second only to St. Paul, set sail for *Goa*, the capital of the Portuguese Indies, in 1542, where, since the year 1510, the Portuguese had been exerting themselves to make conversions, but had only succeeded in bringing back some Nestorians and Thomas-

[1] In 1867, forty-two boys and young men, one after another, spoke Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syriac, Armenian, Arabic, Persian, Kurdish, Turkish, Coptic, the language of the Senegambians, Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Celtic, Irish, Dutch, German, the Swiss dialect, Danish, English, Illyric, Bulgarian, Albanian, Rhaethian, celebrating the advent of the Saviour in hymns and canticles of love and gratitude.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 54 sq.

Christians to the Church. As a rule, the Christians of Goa, who openly practised polygamy and divorce, and lived dissolute lives, were such only in name.[1] Francis, seeing the necessity of first reforming the Christian colonists, began by gaining the children, and through them reached their parents. By serving the sick, comforting the afflicted, and by other exercises of his boundless charity, he soon acquired great influence with high and low and rich and poor. The tribe of the *Parawians*, witnessing his disinterested zeal, were soon favourably disposed towards Christianity. After a short stay at Goa, he went to the shores of *Travancore*, where, at the end of a month after his arrival, he had already baptized ten thousand idolators. This wonderful success can be justly ascribed to no cause other than the miracles he wrought, the sweetness of his temper, his kindly charity, and the aid of good interpreters. "It was," said he, in his account of the event, "a touching sight to behold these neophytes emulating each other in the holy work of destroying the temples of the idols." Leaving Travancore, he set out for *Malacca* and *Isles of the Moluccas and Ternate*. He had already heard terrible accounts of the cannibalism and brutal morals of the inhabitants, but no dangers could shake the courage or chill the ardour of the *Apostle of the Hindoos*. "If aromatic groves and mines of gold were the prize," said he, "there would not be wanting those who would face any danger. And should missionaries yield to merchants in courage? If I save but a single soul, I shall be amply repaid for my toil and labour."

By persevering efforts, Francis succeeded in making many converts among this barbarous people, one of whom, catching somewhat of the zeal of his master, went to preach the Gospel in the Isle of *Manar*. Francis' next care was to have the Penitential Psalms, the Gospels, and a catechism translated into the Indian tongue, which having done, he visited the congregations he had lately established, and returning to *Goa*,[2] March 20, 1548, opened a seminary for the education of Hindoo youths, which continuing under the direction of the members of the Society, became, as time went on, a nursery of Christianity for all India. Satisfied of the flourishing condition of Christianity among the peoples he had already evangelized, Francis, in the year 1549, passed over to *Japan*. This country is divided into several kingdoms or circles, all of which are subject to a single emperor, Mikado, or Dairi-Sama. Before starting he had had the Creed, together with explanations of the text, translated into the Japanese

[1] *Horatius Tursellinus*, De Vita Franc. Xav., qui primus e Soc. Jesu in India et Japonia evangelium propagavit, libb. IV., Rom., 1594, and frequently; also Epp. *Franc. Xav.*, libb. IV., Paris, 1631 (Germ. tr. and explan., by *J. Burg*, Cologne, 1836). *Reithmeyer*, Life of St. Francis Xavier, Schaffh., 1846; by *Bouhours*, London, 1688, Philad., 1841; by *Bartoli* and *J. P. Maffei*, Baltimore, 1859. *Maffei*, Histor. Indicar., libb. XII., Florent., 1588, fol. *Wittmann*, L. c., Vol. II., p. 9 sq. *Henry of Andlaw*, Musings of my Leisure Hours, nro. 3, Freibg., 1864. †*Müllbauer*, Hist. of the Catholic Missions in East India, Munich, 1851.

[2] *Goa*, since 1532 an episcopal see, was raised to metropolitan rank in 1557, and the sees of Cochin, Malacca, and Meliapore were made suffragan to it.

tongue. The people he found ill-disposed to receive Christianity, and the *Bonzes* or Buddhist priests offered a most stubborn resistance to its introduction; but, in the face of such opposition, he eventually succeeded in planting the faith in that land, his most notable conquests being made at *Amangouchi* and in the kingdom of *Bungo*, where, at the expiration of two and a half years, he had baptized several thousands of the natives.

Still later, some of the Japanese princes were converted, and, as a token of their filial submission to the Head of the Church, sent, in the year 1582, a creditable embassy to Rome, which was received by Pope *Gregory XIII.*, with unusual expressions of joy. The days of Francis were now drawing to a close, but before departing this life he longed to carry the faith to *China*, a country which foreigners were forbidden to enter under the severest penalties. After overcoming obstacles seemingly insurmountable, he landed on the island of *San Chan*, six miles out from the mainland. Here the holy missionary brought the labours of his apostolic life to an end. After lingering twelve days upon the shores of this inhospitable island, with no friendly hand to succour and no friendly voice to comfort, he gave up his gentle spirit on the 3rd of December, 1552, his last words being: "In thee, O Lord, have I put my trust; let me not be confounded for ever."[1]

The Jesuits took up and carried forward the work that St. Francis had begun. With the permission of the Archbishop of Cranganore, Father *Nobili* landed in India in 1606. Wearing the dress and copying the habits of the Brahmins ("*Sanias*"), and avoiding all intercourse with the Parias, or the lowest class, who belong to none of the Hindoo castes, he by degrees commanded the respect and won the confidence of the former, of whom seventy were converted, bringing with them into the Church a numerous following. This plan of making converts by wearing the dress and falling in with the customs of the natives, gave rise to a protracted controversy between the Jesuits and Dominicans, known as the controversy "*On Malabar Customs*," a distorted account of which was sent to Pope Gregory XV. in 1623.

In the year 1587, when there were in *Japan*[2] two hundred thousand Christians, two hundred and fifty churches, thirteen seminaries, and a novitiate of the Society of Jesus, a violent persecution broke out against the professors of the new faith. The Jesuits were ordered to quit the country in a body, but through the favour of some of the princes were permitted to remain. Some idea may be had of the extent of their labours in this country when it is related that one of their number, *Father Valignano* († 1606), had three hundred

[1] The last verse of the Te Deum, or Hymn of St. Augustine and St. Ambrose.

[2] *Crasset*, Hist. de l'église de Japon, Par., 1715, 2 vols., 4to (Germ., with engravings, Augsburg, 1743). *P. de Chärlevoix*, Hist. du Christian. dans l'emp. du Japon, Rouen, 1715, 3 T., par. M. D. L. G., Par., 1836, 2 T. (Germ., Vienna, 1830). *Pagès*, Hist. de la religion chrétienne en Japon depuis 1598-1651. Paris, 1869-1870. *Mamachi*, Antiquit. chr., T. II., p. 376 sq. Cf. *Fabricius*, L. c., p. 678.

churches and thirty colleges erected by his individual efforts. The storm of persecution that had lately passed over the Christians was again evoked by the indiscreet zeal of the Franciscans, who revived the old controversy on "*Customs.*" What they had left undone was completed by the Hollanders, who were jealous of their enterprising commercial rivals, the Portuguese, and thus were blasted the hopes of permanently establishing Christianity in the Island Empire. The persecution that followed, commencing in 1596, was marked by deeds of blood and violence unparalleled in any other age or country;[1] the memory of which was revived and perpetuated by our late Pontiff, *Pius IX.*, in 1862.

The desire to evangelize *China* continued to be cherished in the Society of Jesus after St. Francis had passed away. To overcome the serious difficulties that stood in the way of the enterprise, and to disarm the deep-seated prejudices of the Chinese, the *Jesuits* resorted to such ingenious devices as only zeal and charity could suggest.[2] They set themselves to study the manners, the character, and the habits of the people; they were by turn scholars, artisans, mechanics, labourers, becoming all to all that they might gain all to Christ. In the year 1582, three Jesuits, one of whom was the celebrated *Matteo Ricci*,[3] effected an entrance into the Chinese Empire. Ricci, by his splendid literary and scientific abilities, and by wisely assuming the dress and accommodating himself to the tastes of the upper classes, gained such consideration that he was permitted to fix his residence, first at *Canton*, and some time later at *Nankin*. Taking advantage of the high reputation he had acquired by the building of an observatory, and the contributions he had made to the science and literature of the country,[4] he began to preach the Gospel, converting many of the lower classes, and even some of the mandarins or state officials. His fame increased as time went on, and in the year 1600 he was permitted to settle permanently at *Pekin*, where he gained the goodwill of the emperor, converted many of the influential personages about court, and obtained leave to build churches. He died May 11, 1610; was buried with great pomp, and was universally mourned. Of his successors, all of whom emulated his zeal and energy, *Adam Schall*,[5]

[1] *Tanner*, Societas Jesu usque ad sanguinis et vitæ profusionem militans, Pragæ, 1675 (Germ. tr., Prague, 1683, 4 pts.) †*Rump*, the Japanese Martyrs, Münster, 1862.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 52 sq., and *Stuhr*, The Established Religion of the Empire of China, Berlin, 1835. *Abbé Huc*, Christianity in China, New York, 1857, 2 vols.; especially *Drey*, Apologetics, Vol. II., and *Gfroerer*, History of the Primitive Ages, Vol. I., p. 211 sq.

[3] *Wertheim*, Life of Ricci, in Pletz's New Theol. Review, 1833, nro. 3. *Gützlaff*, the most famous of modern Protestant missionaries, says of Ricci: "He spent but twenty-seven years in China, and during that time accomplished a herculean task. He was the first Catholic missionary who penetrated into China, and when he died *there were in the several provinces more than three hundred churches.*"

[4] Among his works published in China are the following: A *Chinese Map of the World;* a little *Catechism*, containing the general principles of Christian morality; a treatise entitled the *Art of Memory*, and a *Dialogue on Friendship*, in imitation of Cicero. The two last are ranked by the Chinese among their most esteemed books. (Tr.)

[5] *Schall*, Relatio de initio et progressu missionis Soc. Jesu in regno Chin., Viennæ

of Cologne (after 1622), was the most remarkable. He was called to preside over the mathematical society of Pekin, and through his influence with the emperor obtained an edict authorising him to build Catholic churches. Unfortunately, the progress of missionary work was greatly retarded by the ill-feeling between the Jesuits and Dominicans, growing out of the controversy on *Chinese customs*[1] (1645). In 1661, the imperial ministers, taking advantage of the youth and inexperience of the new emperor, began to persecute the Christians and to cast the missionaries into prison; but on the accession of *Kang-he* (1661), the Jesuits again recovered the imperial favour. The emperor raised a monument to the memory of Schall, to whose office and honours *Verbiest*, a Netherlander, succeeded. The consideration in which the Jesuits were already held was greatly augmented by a fortunate combination of circumstances. Verbiest encouraged the emperor's love of science by teaching him mathematics, and rendered important service to the whole nation by the invention of an effective cannon. Again, the Jesuit Father *Gerbillon* placed the Chinese Government under lasting obligations by his successful negotiation of a peace between China and Russia in 1689. As the missionaries grew in favour the Christians increased in number; and though these apostolic labourers were few, they could then count twenty thousand of their converts within the country.[2] Louis XIV. sent a reinforcement of six Jesuits, all of them skilful mathematicians, and in 1692 the missionaries were legally authorised to preach the Gospel throughout the whole of the Celestial Empire.

In America[3] the limited intelligence of the Indian was a very serious obstacle in the way of the rapid spread of Christianity. In spite of the formal decision of Pope Paul III., in 1537, declaring that, as *rational* beings, the Indians should be deprived of neither their possessions nor their freedom, their claims to be entitled to the rights or to be endowed with the *dignity of men* was not unfrequently called in question.[4] It must, however, be frankly admitted that the Dominicans, who were chiefly Spaniards, no longer exhibited the zeal which had characterized the earlier missionaries of their Order in these countries. The Jesuits, on the contrary, frightened by no obstacles, displayed all the ardent energy of a youthful Order. Six of their number, of whom *Emmanuel Nobriga* was one, set out for

1665; Ratisbonæ, 1672; Germ., with annotations, by *Mansegg*, Vienna, 1834. *Wittmann*, Vol. II., p. 138 sq. Hist. of the Catholic Missions in the Empire of China, Vienna, 1845, 2 vols.

[1] See § 374.

[2] Others say there were one hundred thousand Christians in China at the death of Father Schall. *Mailly*, Histoire générale de la Chine. (Tr.)

[3] See p. 177 sq.

[4] *Robertson*, History of America (Germ. tr. by *Fred. von Schiller*, Lps., 1777, 2 vols.); particularly Book VIII., but chiefly Noticias secretas de America por Don *J. Juan* y Don *Ant. de Ulloa*, sacadas a luz por Don Dav. *Barry*, London, 1826. *Wittmann*, Vol. I., p. 18 sq. *Prescott*, Hist. of the Conquest of Mexico, 3 vols., London and New York, 1843; Conquest of Peru, 2 vols., 1847. †**Margraf*, The Church and Slavery since the Discovery of America, Tuebg., 1865.

Brazil in 1549. Having rapidly acquired a knowledge of the language of the country, they prevailed upon the savage and ferocious inhabitants, who were accustomed to feast upon the flesh of their slaughtered enemies, and to give themselves over to every sort of excess, to accept the severe teachings and to practise the chaste morality of Christianity For the benefit of these converts, on episcopal see was established at *San Salvador* in 1551.

The most important of the Jesuit missions in America, however, was that of *Paraguay*,[1] which, lying along the banks of the La Plata, was discovered by the Spaniards in the year 1516, by whom it was formally taken possession of in 1536. The first attempts to convert the natives, made by the Franciscans between the years 1580 and 1582, were only partially successful. In 1586 the Jesuits landed in the province of *Tucuman*, and, by their zeal and ability, accomplished what their predecessors had been unable to perform. Turning to account their knowledge of history and of human nature, they adopted the policy followed by the missionaries of the Middle Ages among the Germans, identifying the conversion of the people with their political advancement, the development of the resources of the country, and the cultivation of the soil, thus from Christian parishes gradually forming an independent state. Philip III., King of Spain, authorized the Jesuits to conduct the administration, both civil and religious, on their own plan, and commissioned them, if they wished, to exclude all Spaniards from the *Reductions* of the Order. Their docile neophytes were soon trained to habits of industry, some becoming ordinary labourers, and others skilled workmen. But it was also necessary to defend themselves against the attacks of hostile neighbouring tribes,

[1] *Muratori*, Il Cristianesimo felice nelle missioni del Paraguai, Ven., 1743, 4to. *Charlevoix*, Hist. du Parag., Par., 1765, 3 T., 4to; Germ. tr., Vienna, 1834, 2 vols. *Wittmann*, Vol. I., pp. 29-117. *Montesquieu*, L'esprit des lois, liv. IV., chap. 6, says: "Another example (of that extraordinary character in the institutions of Greece, viz., of their acting on the principle that people who live under a popular government should be trained up to virtue) we have from Paraguay. This has been made the subject of an invidious charge against a Society that considers the pleasure of commanding as the only happiness in life; but it will ever be a glorious undertaking *to render government subservient to human happiness.*

"It is glorious, indeed, for this Society to have been the first in pointing out to those countries the idea of religion joined with that of humanity. By repairing the devastations of the Spaniards, she has begun to heal one of the most dangerous wounds that the human species ever received.

"An exquisite sensibility to whatever she distinguishes by the name of honour, joined to her zeal for a religion which is far more humbling in respect to those who receive than to those who preach its doctrines, has set her upon vast undertakings, which she has accomplished with success. She has drawn wild people from their woods, secured them a maintenance, and clothed their nakedness; and had she only by this step improved the industry of mankind, it would have been sufficient to eternize her fame." (This extract is from "*The Spirit of Laws*," by Baron de Montesquieu, transl. by *Thos. Nugent*, LL.D., and published by Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati, 1873.) A similar declaration was rendered by *Chateaubriand*, who had seen Indian life in America. He says: "The Reductions formed amongst themselves those famous Christian republics, which are, as it were, a relic of antiquity in the New World. They confirmed under our own eyes the great truth recognized by Greece and Rome, that men cannot be truly civilized and empires be solidly established by the shallow opinions of worldly wisdom, but only by the aid of religion."

and for this purpose small arms and parks of artillery were provided. In this way the habits of family-life and the usages of civilized communities were gradually introduced. The execution of the laws was committed to religious brotherhoods, the Jesuits reserving to themselves the privilege of serving the sick. The extensive knowledge of medicine possessed by the Fathers, and their ingenious and prudent charity during seasons of terrible epidemic, which occurred at frequent intervals, greatly facilitated their spiritual dominion over the hearts and souls of the natives. Unhappily, a misunderstanding between them and Bishop *Bernardine de Cardenas*, in 1640, and *John Palafox*, Bishop of Angelopolis, in 1647, gave a rude shock to the prosperity of the new State. Charges the most improbable were brought against the Jesuits, who were accused of having no higher object in view than to secure for themselves the treasures of Paraguay. The neighbouring missions of the province of *Chiquitos* were no less prosperous than those of Paraguay. Even at the present day the expulsion of the Jesuits from those missions calls forth feelings of sincere regret, and has unquestionably retarded for centuries the progress of Indo-American civilization.[1]

The progress of Christianity in *Africa* was incomparably slower than in America, the missionary labours of the *Capuchins* being confined to the Portuguese settlements of *Mozambique*, *Monomotapa*, and *Quiloa*, on the eastern, and of *Congo*, *Angola*, *Benguela*, *Cacongo*, and *Loango*, on the western side of the *Continent;* and to the French settlements on the *Isle de Bourbon* and *Isle de France*.[2] The lack of success in these missions is mainly attributable to the ferocious barbarism and shocking immorality of the natives and to the unhealthiness of the climate.

§ 350. *Theological Science in the Catholic Church.*

†*Werner*, Hist. of Apologetical and Controversial Literature,[3] Vol. IV. By the *same*, Hist. of Catholic Theology, from the Council of Trent to our own Day, Munich, 1866. *Du Pin*, Nouvelle Biblioth. des auteurs eccl. *Richard Simon*, Hist. crit. des principaux commentateurs. Notices concerning celebrated post-Tridentine Theologians, in "*The Catholic*," years 1863, 1864, 1865, and 1866, revised ed. by *Hurter*, Nomenclator literarius recentioris theologiæ, Œniponti, 1871 sq., Fasc. 1-4. The principal works of this epoch, and particularly on *Dogma* and *Exegesis*, reprinted at Paris, in *Migne*, Cursus completus theologiæ, 28 vols., and likewise sacræ scripturæ, 29 vols., 4to.

Historical facts have all a more or less intimate connection with each other. The disturbance caused by any great movement extends in every direction, producing everywhere more or less agitation. Consonant with this law, the struggle against Protestantism, the founding of new Religious Orders, and the controversies that broke

[1] *Bach* (for twenty years a resident of South America), The Jesuits and their Mission of Chiquitos, in South America, published by *Kriegh*, Lps., 1843.

[2] *Külb*, Voyages of Missionaries to Africa, from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century, Ratisbon, 1861.

[3] In this work of *Werner's* we have at length obtained a comprehensive and clear idea of the *controversy* started by Luther and Zwinglius, and carried on by their Protestant followers against Catholics.

out in the very bosom of the Church, were the occasion, if not the cause, of that remarkable and very decided activity in theological science so characteristic of this epoch. It now became evident to Catholic theologians that if they would successfully repel the assaults of Protestants they must give special attention to the study of *dogmatics*, and to this they seriously applied themselves, not as formerly from a speculative point of view, but mainly in connection with historical facts, an alliance which had now become more necessary than ever before, in view of the peculiar tactics adopted by the pretended reformers. The contributions of the *Jesuits* to theological science were invaluable, though the other Religious Orders were equally active, and their labours equally useful. The eminent services of *Melchior Canus* were very justly the pride of the Spanish Dominicans. He was selected by the University of Salamanca, on account of his extraordinary ability, to represent that famous seat of learning at the Council of Trent, where he became distinguished even among that celebrated body of eminent divines (†1560). His best known work is that entitled *De Locis Theologicis*, in twelve books, being an admirable introduction to the study of dogmatic theology. It contains very useful researches on the sources, the importance, and the utility of dogmatic theology; of its relations to other branches of science, and of the application of philosophy to theology.[1] The characteristics of the work are deep and vigorous thought, great originality, and terseness and energy of expression.

Denys Petau (*Petavius*), of Orléans, was, beyond all question, the most learned theologian the Society of Jesus produced. His works are of such solidity and depth, and withal so complete, that anyone desirous to make a serious study of theology must necessarily consult them. Apart from his labours in publishing the works of many historical and philosophical writers, as, for instance, those of Epiphanius, of Synesius, of Nicephorus, and of the Emperor Julian, and his own work on history and astronomy, entitled *Rationale Temporum*, which of itself formed an epoch in literature, his celebrated book, known as *Theologica Dogmata*,[2] attracted universal attention. It was intended that this work should be a complete exposition of the teachings professed everywhere and at all times by the Catholic Church, in contradistinction to the changing creeds of heretics. Unfortunately, the premature death of the author, in 1652, prevented its completion. It seems a marvel that the short space of a single life should have been sufficient to accomplish labours so considerable, in a manner so exact and conscientious, and in every way so remarkable. The Latinity of Father Petau is easy and graceful, and his expositions clear and methodical. Combining, in a comprehensive and masterly way, the sciences of history and dogmatics, he was the first to treat successfully

[1] *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclopæd., s. v. Canus; apud *Werner*, Hist. of Apol., etc., Vol. IV. Good ed., Padua, 1762.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 14, note 1.

dogmatic teaching from an historical point of view; while his intimate knowledge of Platonic philosophy enabled him to correct the numerous errors of the Fathers of the Church in regard to Plato's teachings.

In the controversies which the Protestant revolt necessarily occasioned, *Eck*,[1] *Cochlaeus*, *Emser*, *Faber*, *Erasmus*, *Gropper*, *Pighius*, and *Stanislaus Hosius* became very justly distinguished. Mention should also be made of the excellent work entitled "*German Theology*," published at Münster, in 1528, by the humble and saintly *Berthold*, Bishop of Chiemsee. Its object was announced to be "to supply authentic information to a deluded people, and to point out what was to be received as certain truth, and on what grounds." This little work, whether considered from a *grammatical* or *theological* point of view, is one of the most interesting of controversial writings in the whole of the Catholic literature of Germany.[2] Mention should also be made of the labours of *John Nas* (1534-1590), of the Order of St. Francis, and Auxiliary Bishop of Brixen, which were, in their way, very important.[3]

But of all the theologians of this age, the most eminent beyond comparison was *Robert Bellarmine*, who was born at Montepulciano, in Tuscany, October 4, 1542, and entered the Society of Jesus in 1560. Extremely severe towards himself, an enemy to all indulgence, and an indefatigable worker, he left behind him writings so numerous and valuable that no better evidence of the holiness and self-sacrifice of his life could be required. He was a successful preacher, but was especially distinguished for the ability with which he taught the various branches of theology. Having been sent to the University of Louvain by the general, Francis Borgia, to complete his theological studies, he was there appointed to a chair of theology in the year 1670, and for six or seven years continued to hold this post of honour and influence. While here he wrote a Hebrew grammar and a sort of patrology or biographical sketches of ecclesiastical writers (*De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*), a work which is highly esteemed even at the present day. Having been called to Rome, he again taught theology for twelve consecutive years, and there composed a work on Controversies, the full title of which is *Disputationes de controversis Christianæ fidei articulis, libri IV.*[4] He was intimately acquainted with all the literature of Protestantism. The works of Luther, Melanchthon, Beza, Calvin, of the Socinians, and in fact of all the enemies of the Church, were familiar to him. The various points in controversy and

[1] Enchiridion locorum communium adv. Lutherum et alios hostes ecclesiæ, Landeshuti, 1525.

[2] New edition, by *Reithmeier*, Munich, 1852. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. X., p. 884 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 23, p. 334 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 113-124.

[3] *Schoepf*, Joh. Nasus, etc., Bozen, 1860. Dr. *Raess*, Converts, Vol. I., p. 298 sq.

[4] First edition, Rome, 1581-1592, 3 vols., fol., besides many other editions; recudi curavit, *Fr. Sausen*, Mogunt, 1842 sq.; a favourite ed. is that of Naples, 1856-1859; Germ. transl., by *Gumposch*, Augsburg, 1842 sq. Opera omnia, ed. *Justinus Fèvre*, publ. by Louis Vivès, Paris, in 12 vols., 4to.

the true state of every question were set forth by him with precision and judicial fairness. In his exegetics he gave, as a rule, a brief statement of the points which he intended either to develop or refute. His demonstrations, based upon tradition, are unusually full and satisfactory. Of his exegetical works, his commentary on the Psalms deserves special mention, it being remarkable for lucidity and accuracy of thought, as well as for earnestness and an intelligent and sympathetic appreciation of the meaning of this portion of the Sacred Writings. This praise would be the more cordially granted to Bellarmine's Commentary, had not the author in numerous passages, where the Vulgate deviates from the Hebrew, and where the two cannot be reconciled without doing violence to the original, uniformly followed the reading of the former.[1]

In 1599 he was, much against his own will, created a cardinal, but this elevation made no change in the austere habits of his life. His simple manners and incessant labours were a standing rebuke to the listless lives of the great dignitaries with whom he came in contact.

In 1602 he was appointed Archbishop of *Capua*, and in consequence was obliged to leave Rome. He remained in Capua until the year 1606, when he was relieved of his pastoral charge by Paul V. During his stay there he wrote an excellent *catechism* and a work addressed to his nephew, entitled "*Admonitio ad Episcopum Theanensem, etc.,*" which of itself is an ample proof of the energy and conscientiousness with which he applied himself to the discharge of his new functions. Finally, his deep and sincere piety and his humble resignation to the will of God are abundantly attested in his ascetical works, entitled "*De ascensione mentis in Deum per scalas rerum creatarum*" and "*De gemitu columbæ, seu de bono lacrymarum, etc.*" He died September 17, 1621.

During the same period *Peter Canisius* rendered a signal service to both clergy and laity by the publication, in 1554, of a Larger and a Smaller Catechism. The former was a compendium of Christian doctrine, bearing the title "*Summa doctrinæ Christianæ*" (*Catechismus Major*); and the latter, an abridgment of the former, published in 1561, and having the title "*Institutiones Christianæ, sive parvus catechismus Catholicorum.*" A still shorter edition of this abridgment was published for the use of children. It was not long before the "*Summa*" was translated into every living language. The edition published at Paris in 1686, by the authority of the archbishop, enumerates more than four hundred previously issued. It is said that it was largely instrumental in converting numerous Protestants.[2] Even the Roman Catechism (*Catechismus Romanus ad parochos*), published in 1566, which is a repository of all kinds of information needful to clergymen in giving religious instruction, did not supersede that of

[1] See *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., art. "Bellarmine," towards the end. (Tr.)
[2] *Riess*, Life of Blessed Peter Canisius, ch. III., pp. 109-125.

Canisius.[1] The style of the Roman Catechism, which is clear and elegant, is mainly the work of the celebrated linguist, *Paul Manutius*, who revised the manuscript after it came from the hands of its authors, who were three Dominicans. This work having been written by order of the Council of Trent, became, like the synodal decrees themselves, a sort of Rule of Faith. Minor controversial works were also written at this period by the Jesuits *Gregory of Valencia* (*Analysis fidei Catholicæ*, † 1603), *Francis Coster* (*Enchiridion controversiarum nostri temporis*, † 1619), and *Martin Becanus* (*Manuale controvers.*, *libb. V.*), those of the last two being highly esteemed. Becanus was also the author of an *Analogia Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, in which he shows the harmony between the two. Valuable works were written on particular dogmas of faith, and the Jansenists, *Nicole* and *Arnauld*, gained quite a name by the ability with which they defended the Blessed Eucharist and the Sacrament of Penance against the attacks of the Reformers, in their work *Perpétuité de la foi catholique*.

In lands like *Spain*, which lay at a distance from the turbulent scenes of the Reformation, the study of *mediæval* philosophy and theology, particularly that of St. Thomas, was revived, and calm and systematic expositions given of the principal teachings of the Church. The ablest representative of this theological tendency was the Jesuit, *Suarez* († 1617), who taught philosophy and theology successively at Segovia, Valladolid, Alcalà, Salamanca, Rome, and Coimbra (in Portugal). He was also well versed in many of the sciences, though his method of treating them in the lecture-room lacked conciseness and directness.[2] Other members of the Order, however, notably *Maldonatus* and *Possevin*, achieved a certain measure of success in their efforts to simplify the science of theology.[3]

So much of the thought of this age was given to the discussion of dogmatic teachings that comparatively little attention was bestowed on the study of *moral theology*. It was not, however, wholly neglected; and, as in the preceding age, the efforts in this direction took the form either of scholasticism and casuistry, or of mysticism and asceticism. Besides the treatises of *Erasmus* and *Juan Luis Vivès*, the labours of those *Jesuits* who wrote on special portions of moral theology deserve separate mention. It will be sufficient to enumerate the names of *Toletus* († 1596), *Vasquez* († 1604), *Laymann* († 1635), *Escobar* († 1669), and *Busenbaum* († 1668), whose work, entitled *Medulla theologiæ moralis facili ac perspicua methodo resolvens casus conscientiæ, etc.*, *Monast*, 1645, was extensively used. We shall again have occasion to refer to the mystical and ascetical writers who

[1] Catech. romanus ex decreto Conc. Trid. ad ed. *principem* Manutianam a., 1566, ed. *Ritter*, Vrat., 1837; ed. *Smets*, Lat. et Germ., Bielef., 1844 sq.; ed. Rom., 1845. Catechism of the Council of Trent, trans. by *J. Donovan*, Dublin, 1829, Baltimore, 1829.

[2] †**Werner*, Francis Suarez, and the Scholasticism of the last Centuries, Ratisbon, 1861, 2 vols. Works, 23 vols., fol., Lyons, 1603 sq., Mentz, 1612 sq., Antwerp, 1614 sq., Venice, 1740; new ed., in 28 vols., sm. 4to, by *Louis Vivès*, Paris, 1856, 1872. Summa, seu compendium, by *Fr. Noël*, S. J., 2 vols., fol., Genev., 1732, Paris, 1861. (Tr.)

[3] Cf. *Possevin*, Bibliotheca selecta, Colon, 1607, pp. 120-130.

treated of moral theology. Unfortunately, the theory of "*Probabilism*," started in the year 1572 by *Bartholomew Medina*, a Dominican, was introduced into the schools of theology, and gave rise to a series of propositions of a lax and demoralizing tendency. The theory was ably controverted by some of the most celebrated professors, and strongly opposed by the ecclesiastical authorities, who demanded that the *limits* within which it might be safely applied should be clearly and precisely defined. To correct this theory, others were started, which gradually came to be known as "*Æquiprobabilism*," "*Probabiliorism*," and "*Tutiorism*."

During this period the study of exegetics was stimulated by the instructions given by the Council of Trent in its Fifth Session on Reformation; by the aids which the Complutensian *Polyglot* Bible afforded; by the labours of such Hebrew grammarians and lexicographers as *Pelican*, *Bellarmine*, and, pre-eminently, *Santes Pagninus* († 1541), who was the author of a Hebrew dictionary and a method for interpreting Holy Scripture;[1] and, finally, by the movement set on foot by *Erasmus*. To all these causes is to be ascribed the great advance made in Biblical studies during these years. An introduction to the study of Sacred Scripture was written by the Dominican, *Sixtus of Siena* († 1569),[2] which, like the *Antwerp polyglot* (1569), mainly prepared by *Montanus*, and *Lejay's Paris polyglot* (1645), which in syntactical accuracy and general literary merit is superior to the former, is very valuable as an aid to obtain a correct understanding of the text. On the other hand, the *rigorous principles* then prevalent *concerning the inspiration of the Sacred Books* was a serious hindrance to the progress of exegetical studies. Starting with the principle that every word of Holy Writ had been, literally speaking, inspired by God, the commentators were forced to put subtile interpretations upon the text, which, while they might be learned and ingenious, were frequently very wide of the truth.

The most conspicuous opponents of this rigid rule of interpretation were the Jesuits, *Hamel* and *Lessius*, of Louvain, who contended that for a book to be divine and canonical required neither textual inspiration nor even that of every thought; and that a book, like the Second of Machabees, which is, they said, a purely human production, might be regarded as canonical, provided the Holy Ghost should, after its composition, become a witness to the entire truth of its contents. These opinions, as soon as published, were very justly assailed by the theological faculties of Louvain and Douai, and condemned by the bishops of Belgium. The matter was brought by Pope Sixtus V. before his own tribunal. He put off giving a decision till the dis-

[1] Isagoge ad sacras literas lib. unus; Isagoge ad mysticos sacr. scripturæ sensus, lib. 18. Colon., 1540, fol.

[2] Bibliotheca sancta, ex præcipuis cathol. ecclesiæ auctorib. collecta, etc. Venet., 1566, fol.; Frcf., 1575, fol.; Col., 1626, 4to; ibid., 1686, in fol.; Neap., 1742, in fol., 2 vols.; liber III. contains Ars interpretandi sacras scripturas absolutissima; separate edition, Colon., 1577, 1588, in 8vo. His Life, by Father *Milante*

putants should return to a better temper; and, after a time, a moderate judgment, based upon the teachings of the best interpreters of the *School of Antioch*, and notably upon those of St. John Chrysostom, was adopted. It was not long before a number of Catholic exegetical writers published works in refutation of the exclusive and one-sided interpretations of the Reformers. Cardinal *Cajetan* gave his entire life to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, and his ingenious and strikingly original interpretations abundantly prove that he possessed talents specially qualifying him for the task.[1] Nevertheless, his works have been severely criticized, mainly on *philological* grounds, by Melchior Canus and others. A translation of the Bible, made by *Vatable* († 1547), during the reign of Francis I., has gone through many editions, chiefly on account of the clear and concise remarks added by him to explain the text. It should be added, however, that the work has not escaped censure.[2] The commentary on Josue by *Andrew Masius* was pronounced by Richard Simon, the celebrated critic, a masterpiece of grammatical and historical interpretation. Masius, who assisted in editing the Antwerp polyglot, was the equal of Cajetan as an exegetical writer, and his superior in philological attainments. Cardinal *Sadolet*, Bishop of Carpentras († 1547), who was the author of many works on philosophy, made an attempt to harmonize the various Protestant Confessions with the teachings of the Church, and with the same view published *a commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans*, whence the Protestants had drawn the bulk of the arguments in support of their teachings. Written in the form of a dialogue, and in elegant Ciceronian Latin, it was in a large measure successful. *Gaspar Contarini*, also a cardinal, and thoroughly conversant with the Greek commentators, published brief and valuable annotations on the Epistles of St. Paul († 1542).

Claude d'Espence, a doctor of the Sorbonne († 1571), was also the author of excellent commentaries, in which he made it a point to tell some wholesome truths to popes, bishops, and the clergy in general. *Jansenius*, Bishop of Ghent († 1576), who seems to have been the forerunner of Hamel and Lessius, published a valuable *Concordance of the Gospels*. *Agellio*, Bishop of Acerno, in the kingdom of Naples († 1608), *Bellarmine*, and *Simon de Muis* wrote excellent commentaries on the Psalms.

The Jesuit, *Jacques Bonfrère*, professor at Douai († 1643), wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, which is highly thought of, even at the present day. *Prado* († 1595), *Villalpando* († 1608), and *Ribera*, all Jesuits, published very good commentaries, the two former on Ezechiel,[3] and the last on the Twelve Minor Prophets and the Epistle of St.

[1] Commentarii in V. et N. T., Lugd., 1639, 5 T., fol.

[2] Of the many editions of this work, the best is that brought out by Nicole Henri, Paris, 1729 and 1745.

[3] *J. B. Villalpandi* et *H. Pradi* in Ezechielem explanationes et apparatus urbis ac templi Hierosolymitani commentariis et imaginibus illustratus, Romæ, 1596-1606, 3 vols., fol. max. (Tr.)

Paul to the Hebrews. Those on Ezechiel are, however, not so highly esteemed as those of *Christopher de Castro*, *Vieira*, and *Aliazar* on the Apocalypse. The commentaries of *Pineda* on the book of Job, and of *Gaspar Sanctius* († 1628) on nearly all the books of the Old Testament, are wearisomely prolix. *Tullianus* wrote commentaries on the two books of the Machabees. The moral, allegorical, and anagogical explanations in the celebrated work of *Cornelius a Lapide* (Van den Steen, † 1637) are also very lengthy, his best commentaries being those on the *Pentateuch* and the Epistles of *St. Paul.* The admirable quotations from the Fathers give the work a special value. It is, however, advisable to verify these extracts by reference to their originals.[1] The work of Father *Mersenne*, a member of the Order of St. Francis of Paula, entitled Celebrated Questions on Genesis (*Questiones celebres in Genesin*, 1623), is original in the treatment of the subject, and attests the author's proficiency in mathematics. Had he been more conversant with the laws of meteorology and of the physical sciences in general, he would not have committed the blunder of attacking the system of *Copernicus*, Canon of Frauenburg († 1643). The attitude of Rome towards Copernicus and *Galileo* († 1638), incomparably more liberal to science than that assumed by the Protestant churches from the first moment of their existence,[2] and dishonestly and persistently misrepresented, has been in our own day fully investigated, with the aid of authentic documents, and triumphantly vindicated.[3]

The Jesuits, *Tirinus* and *Menochius* († 1655), published brief explanations of the whole of the Sacred Text, which were favourably received, and remained long in use. We must also mention here the commentaries of *Francis Toletus* on the Epistle to the Romans, the Gospel of St. Luke, and particularly on the doctrinal passages of the Gospel of St. John; the questions and dissertations of *Alphonsus Salmeron* († 1585), in 16 vols., fol., on nearly the whole of the New Testament; and the commentaries of the Jesuit, *Lorinus* († 1634), on the books of Numbers and Leviticus and on the Psalms; also on the Acts of the Apostles and on the Catholic Epistles.

The works already mentioned, though each has its own merit, are not to be compared with the productions of the three following exe-

[1] New edition, Melitæ, 1842-1852, 10 T., 4to, and Parisiis, 1866-1868, 24 vols., sm. 4to (Louis Vivès, publisher). (Tr.)

[2] See § 338, page 400, of this volume.

[3] "The Holy See versus *Galileo Galilei*, and the Astronomical System of *Copernicus*." (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., in four articles.) *Bonn Review*, new series, year IV., nro. 2, p. 118 sq. *Deschamps*, The Truth and Reasonableness of Faith (Germ. rev. ed., by *Heinrich*, Mentz, 1857). See *Aschbach's* and the *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., article "*Galilei.*" The famous dictum "*E pur si muove*," or "And yet it (the earth) does move," was first invented at the end of the eighteenth century, as has been shown by the mathematician, *Heis*, in the periodical "*Gaea*," year 1868. Besides numberless writings, which have appeared lately in Italian, French, German, and English, we have received that by *Gebler*, Galileo Galilei and the Roman Court, according to authentic sources, Stuttgart, 1876. Cfr. La condamnation de Galilée, etc., in the Quarterly "*Revue des Questions scientifiques*," Louvain, April, 1877. (Tr.)

getical writers. The first two are profitably consulted, even in our own day, and the last, though less known, is not inferior to either of them as a commentator. These are: 1. The Jesuit, Father *John Maldonatus*, who was born in Estramadura in 1534, completed his studies with unusual distinction at Salamanca, and was an excellent Greek and Hebrew scholar and a fine historian. After teaching Greek, philosophy, and theology for some time at Salamanca, he entered the Society of Jesus in 1562, and, taking up his residence in Paris, was there appointed to a professorship. His lectures on the *Four Gospels*, which were published only after his death, by Fronto le Duc, at Pont-à-Mousson, in 1596, are his most remarkable productions. As in the case of Abelard, so numerous were the crowds that flocked to hear him, that, unable to accommodate them in any of the great lecture-rooms of Paris, he was obliged to speak in the court of the college. It was in consequence of his able debate at Sedan with a Calvinist minister that the Nuke de Bouillon was converted to the Catholic faith. He died at Rome in 1583, shortly after having received a commission from Pope Gregory XIII. to assist in editing a new edition of the Septuagint. 2. *William Estius*, Chancellor of the University of Douai, had such facility in explaining the most difficult passages of Holy Scripture, and notably those contained in the *Epistles of the Apostles*, that his lecture-room was filled with hearers desirous of profiting by his learning. Inferior to Maldonatus as an historian and philologist, he was his superior in depth of penetration and in ability to grasp and draw out the drift and sequence of thought in the apostolic writings.[1] 3. Father *Justiniani*, also a *Jesuit*, was the author of a commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul. So learned are the paraphrases, so luminous the dissertations, and so extensive and accurate the erudition contained in this work, that though less known than that of Estius, it is equally valuable, and has not attracted the attention it deserves.[2]

We should mention finally, the numerous translations of the Bible made during this epoch into the various European languages. In *Germany* alone, not to speak of other countries, a translation of the New Testament by *Emser* was published in 1527, and in 1534 and 1537 translations of the whole Bible by *Dietenberger* and *Eck*, and still later by *Ulenberg* († 1617), all of which were works of unusual merit. Translations of the entire Bible were published in Poland by the Jesuit, *James Wujek*, and in France by *Véron* and others.

With a view to combating Protestantism with its own weapons,

[1] A new edition of the commentaries of *Maldonatus* and *Estius* was recently published by *Sausen*, Mogunt., 1841 sq. A third edition of Maldonatus was edited by Bishop *Martin*, Mogunt., 1862; a fourth by Dr. *J. M. Raich*, Mogunt., 1874. (Tr.) The second edition of Estius, revised by *Holzammer*, Mogunt., 1858 sq. Maldonatus also wrote a commentary on the prophets Jeremias, Baruch, Ezechiel, and Daniel; and a full explanation on Ps. cix., and scholia or the Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Isaias. See *Dixon*, Introd. to the S. Script., Vol. II., p. 226 (Tr.), and cf. *J. M. Prat*, S. J., *Maldonat* et l'université de Paris au XVIe siècle, Par., 1857.

[2] Ed. Lugduni, 1611-1614, 3 T., f.

Leisentritt, Dean of the Chapter of Budissin, published, in 1573, a large collection of *sacred songs* and an *Agenda* or Liturgy *in German*. A still larger collection of sacred songs was published, in 1631, by *Corner*, prior of the Benedictine monastery of Göttweih.

Owing to the pretensions put forward by their opponents, the Catholics were obliged to show by *historical* evidence that the teaching and discipline of the Church were based upon *Apostolic* tradition and the belief of the primitive Christians. The assumptions of Protestants were successfully refuted by the Catholic historians of the period, of whom the following are the best known: *Baronius* and his continuators;[1] *Peter de Marca*, Archbishop-elect of Paris († 1662), whose controversies in defence of the episcopal system are well known (*De concordia imperii et sacerdotii*); Cardinal *du Perron* († 1618), who wrote his *De ecclesiastica et politica potestate* against *Richer*, and in support of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility; *Panvinio*, an Augustinian, who wrote a History of the Popes († 1568); and *Lawrence Surius*, a Carthusian of Cologne, and a convert († 1578), whose versatile talents adorned nearly every branch of literature. His Lives of the Saints, in six folio volumes,[2] stimulated the *Bollandists*, whose centenary labours were begun in the year 1643, to make a more exhaustive use of the precious materials within their reach.[3]

Finally, the *ascetical writings* of the epoch, which were, as a rule, the productions of men occupied with other labours, strikingly illustrate the beneficent influence of the Middle Ages upon Catholic literature. Chief among these are the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius, which have been mainly instrumental in preserving in the Society which he founded the pious and profitable habit of meditation. Edifying lives of St. Ignatius and St. Francis Xavier were written by *Maffei* and *Tursellinus*. Numerous works on *pastoral theology*, the outgrowth of the renewed and vigorous religious life then setting in, were also published, of some of which particular mention should be made. The most important are, *Ecclesiastes, seu concionator evangelicus*, by *Erasmus*; *Instructiones confessariorum et concionatorum*, by *St. Charles Borromeo*; *Rhetorica ecclesiastica*, libri III., by *Valerius Augustine*; a work of the same title, by *Louis of Granada*, a Dominican; but, above all, the works published by the celebrated preachers of this age. Of these the greatest names in Italy were, *Clarius*, Bishop of Fuligno; *Cornelius Musso*, Bishop of Bitonto, in the kingdom of Naples († 1574); *Charles Borromeo*; and the Jesuit, *Paul Segneri* († 1694). In France, *Simon Vigor*, Archbishop of Narbonne († 1575); the Jesuit, *Claude de Lingendes* († 1666); his kinsman, *John de Lingendes*; and *Francis Fécrault*, of the Oratory († 1670). In Spain, *John of Avila*, the Apostle of Andalusia, and *Louis of Granada*; and in Poland, *Peter Skarga* and *Birkowski*.

[1] See Vol. I., p. 32.

[2] Edited Cologne, 1570 sq., 1576-1581; Suppl. Vol. VII., by *F. J. Mosander*, Ibid., 1586; best ed., Ibid., 1618, in 12 vols.

[3] See Vol. I., page 17, note 1.

Besides the ascetical works published in Germany, of which we have already spoken,[1] the faith and piety of the age were revived and sustained by the writings of *St. Teresa*, *St. John of the Cross*, the pious *Louis of Granada*, *St. Francis de Sales* (Philothea and Letters to People living in the World), *Lawrence Scupuli* (Spiritual Combat), *Bellarmine*, *Alphonsus Rodriguez* (The Practice of Christian Perfection), *Louis da Ponte* (Meditations on the Mysteries of Faith), *M. Olier*, founder of the Congregation of St. Sulpice († 1657—Catechism of Interior Life), and *Condren*, second superior-general of the French Oratory († 1641—Idea of the True Priesthood of J. C.)

When Louis of Granada presented to Gregory XIII. copies of "The Sinner's Guide," and "Christian Life," of his excellent Catechism and his treatise on prayer, the Pope expressed his delight in words which must have been extremely gratifying to the pious author. "You have," said the Holy Father, "done a greater service to those who may seek instruction in your pages, than if by prayer you had restored sight to the blind or brought the dead to life." We need not marvel, then, why these works have been so frequently reproduced in our own day, why they have been translated into so many languages, or why so much pains is taken to issue correct and serviceable editions of them.

§ 351. *New Controversies on Grace—Baius, Molina, Jansenius.*

The fear entertained that the extreme tenets of Protestantism, when applied to the workings of divine grace in regenerated man; and carried out to their last results, would not be without influence on Catholic divines, was verified in the case of *Michael Baius*, a professor of theology at Louvain (after 1551).[2] He was hardly seated in the professor's chair when, like his colleague, *John Hessels*, he began to assail the scholastic method, and to introduce the positive. After explaining the doctrines of faith, he supported them with texts of Scripture and passages from the writings of such Fathers as St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Gregory, but chiefly from those of *St. Augustine*. In defence of his method of teaching, he pointed out that Protestants had distorted the sense of the Sacred Text, and claimed that it was his aim to restore its true meaning. On the return of his older colleagues, *Tapper* and *Ravenstein*, from the Council of Trent, they, together with other advocates of the *scholastic* method, expressed their disapprobation of his course and their alarm as to the tendency of the *system* which he was beginning to mould into definite shape. In consequence, acting in concert with

[1] *Brischar*, The Cath. Pulpit Orators of Germany during the last three centuries, Schaffh., 1867 sq., 3 vols.

[2] Baji Opp. Coloniæ, 1696, 4to. At the beginning of the year 1563: De libero arbitrio; de justitia; de justificatione and de sacrificio. After his return from Trent, the treatises: De meritis operum; de prima hominis justitia et de virtutibus impiorum; de sacramentis in genere, etc. Conf. *Kuhn*, s. v. Bay, in the *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd.; *Linsemann*, Michael Bajus. Tueb., 1867; *Scheeber*, Supplements towards a hist. of Bajanism (Catholic, March, 1868).

the Franciscans, they sent, in the year 1560, eighteen of the propositions of Baius for examination to the Theological Faculty of the Sorbonne.[1] As only five of the propositions were pronounced heretical and three false,[2] their author felt that he might with all propriety publish a defence of his position. In this, while freely admitting that some of the propositions were faulty, he contended that the greater number of them were correct, being, as he said, in complete harmony with the words of Holy Writ and the teachings of St. Augustine. Cardinal *Granvelle*, Archbishop of Malines and Governor of the Netherlands, anxious to put an end to a controversy which, he believed, had its origin in a misapprehension of terms and expressions not in general use among theologians, prevailed upon *Philip II.* to send the professors, Baius and John Hessels, together with Cornelius Jansenius, subsequently Bishop of Ghent, and at that time (1563) a well-known Biblical commentator, to Trent as deputies of the University. On his return, Baius published a number of Tracts, in which he defended and still further developed his peculiar views. These publications were the occasion of a fresh controversy, during which his colleague, Hessels, died (1566).

The affair was eventually submitted to the judgment of the Holy See, and by a bull, dated October 1, 1567, *Pius V.*, without naming their author, condemned seventy-nine propositions of Baius. The disciples of Baius refused to submit, maintaining that the condemned propositions, in the sense in which they were stated, were not to be found in the writings of their master. In consequence, the condemnation was renewed in more precise terms by *Gregory XIII.* in 1579.

In the following year, Baius sent on to Rome an act of submission, thus escaping expulsion from his office.[3] He also received at this time a copy of the bull of Pius V., which had heretofore been denied him. The condemned propositions related chiefly to original sin, free-will, regenerated nature, and the relation of good works to grace, the fundamental one being *that fallen nature, destitute of divine grace, is absolutely incapable of well-doing, and, as a consequence, cannot leave off evil-doing.*

In direct opposition to the definition of the Council of Trent, Baius seemed at least to hold that the Blessed Virgin was not exempt from either original or actual sin.[4] The system of Baius, which spread rapidly, was vehemently assailed by the Jesuit Fathers, *Leonard Lessius* and *John Hamel*, members of the Faculty of Louvain, whose zeal apparently got the better of their judgment, and carried

[1] In *D'Argentré*, Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, T. II., pp. 1-203, and in *Du Pin*, Bibliothèque, T. XVI., p. 139 sq.

[2] *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, T. II. (Tr.)

[3] This bull is also found in the stereotyped edition of the Council of Trent, Lps., 1842, pp. 273-278. *Du Chesne*, Hist. du Bajanisme, Douai, 1731, 4to. Conférences d'Angers sur la grâce, Paris, 1789.

[4] *Werner*, Fr. Suarez, Vol. I., p. 380 sq.

them to the opposite extreme. Hence thirty-four of *their* propositions, which the partisans of Baius claimed had the flavour of Semi-Pelagianism, were disclaimed in 1587 by the Theological Faculty of Louvain. With a view of promoting good-will between the two parties, *Sixtus V.*, in the following year, commanded both to abstain from mutual recriminations.

Unfortunately, about this time a work appeared in Spain, written by the Jesuit, *Louis Molina*, and bearing the title "*Liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis, divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione et reprobatione concordia*," which at once revived the controversy between the *Jesuits* and *Dominicans*.[1] The former defended the teaching of Scotus; the latter that of St. Augustine. The Molinists, in recommendation of their doctrine, said *that if what is understood to be rigorous Augustinianism were to be accepted, the tenets of the Reformers could not be easily refuted.*

Desirous, if possible, to harmonize the two systems, Molina maintained that by his own natural powers man may in some sort contribute towards his conversion and the performance of good works. In support of this position he brought forward the teaching of *Fonseca*, who had been his master, on the so-called *mediate* knowledge of God (*Scientia Dei media*), which is, that God foresees such future events as would take place if certain given conditions, which are never fulfilled, were carried out; as, for example, the instances in 1 Samuel, xxiii. 11 sq., and Matthew, xi. 21.

Molina's book was attacked by the Dominicans, *Alvarez* and *Thomas de Lemos*, who upheld the Thomist system, maintaining that grace influences the free consent of the will, the latter bearing the relation to the former of physical effect to physical cause. Preserving the analogy, the agency of grace is called physical premotion or predetermination. The Jesuits, *Gregory of Valencia*, *Arrubal*, *La Bastide*, *Toletus*, and others, came to the defence of Molina, whereupon Pope Clement VIII., at the request of both parties, solicited the advice of the bishops, universities, and theologians, and established at Rome, in 1699, the celebrated Congregation "*De Auxiliis*,"[2] to determine the question concerning the relation of divine grace to man's conversion. Clement died before a decision was arrived at, and his successor, Paul V., continued the examination till the year 1607, when he suspended the labours of the Congregation, reserving to himself the right of making known the result at some future day, and (probably at the instance of Baronius) permitting both parties to hold their opinions, and prohibiting each from accusing their adversaries of heresy.

The prohibition, though renewed by Urban VIII., Innocent X., and Innocent XI., was not unfrequently disregarded in the heat of

[1] It appeared first at Lisbon, 1588; then, enlarged, at Antwerp, 1595. Cf. *Werner* St. Thomas of Aquino, Vol. III., pp. 389-430.

[2] *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. II., pp. 786-794; Fr. trans., Vol. 5, pp 194-203.

controversy by the representatives of both parties. The system of Molina, which was more or less Pelagian in tendency, was modified by the Jesuits into what is known as *Congruism* (*Gratia congrua et incongrua*). This system, which is quite different from pure Molinism, was perfected some time later by the celebrated Jesuits, *Suarez* and *Vasquez*.[1] According to Molinism, the *free consent* of the will is the *sole* and *only* condition to the action of grace; whereas, according to Congruism, the action of grace is dependent on the *congruity of grace* itself, and, as a consequence, on the very nature and power of grace. Hence, congruous grace (*gratia congrua*) is always efficacious (*efficax*); whereas incongruous grace (*gratia incongrua*), inasmuch as man does not correspond to it, is only sufficient (*sufficiens*). This system, *Aquaviva*, the General of the Jesuits, ordered to be taught in all the schools of the Society (1613).

The Molinist controversy was again revived by the publication of a treatise, written by *Garasse*, a Jesuit, and assailed by *John Duvergier*, who subsequently became Abbot of St. Cyran. *Cornelius Jansenius*, a friend of Duvergier's, then a professor at Louvain, and afterwards Bishop of Ypres († 1638), undertook to examine the whole Augustinian system of grace, embodying the results of his labours in a work entitled "*Augustinus*." In the preface to this book, as also in his last will, he declared that *he submitted the work to the judgment of the Holy See*.[2] The work is divided into three parts, in the first of which the author professes to show the points of contact and agreement between the teachings of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians and those of the Molinists; in the second, he points out that reason alone is not sufficient to give a knowledge of the doctrine of grace, which must be sought in Holy Scripture, in the writings of the Fathers, and in the decrees of Councils; and then goes on to speak of the condition of man before and after the Fall; finally, in the third, he speaks of man's conversion, which, he says, is accomplished by *the irresistible action of grace, man of himself being absolutely helpless to contribute anything towards it*.

The publication of the work was opposed by the Jesuits, on the ground that it contained Calvinistic errors on predestination. This remonstrance was fruitless, and the author being already dead, a first edition of it appeared at Louvain in 1640, and a second in the following year, containing an approbation from the doctors of the *Sorbonne*. A violent controversy at once broke out.

The Jesuits made a collection of the suspected propositions, giving special prominence to the utterances of Jansenius against the Fathers, the Schoolmen, and their own teachings. By the bull "*In eminenti*" of 1642, Pope Urban VIII. forbade the *Augustinus* to be read. As the Jesuits were endeavouring to show that all the propositions, previously condemned by Pius V. and Gregory XIII., were

[1] *Hortig*, Ch. Hist., continued by *Döllinger*, Vol. II., p. 810 sq.

[2] Augustinus, seu doctrina Augustini de humanæ naturæ sanitate, ægritudine, medicina adv. Pelagianos et Massilienses, Lovanii, 1640; Parisiis, 1641, and frequently.

clearly contained in the *Augustinus*, *Cornet*, the Syndic of the Sorbonne, submitted (1649) seven propositions, taken from the writings of Jansenius, to the judgment of the Faculty, which were, in the course of the examination, reduced to *five*.[1] After considerable discussion, and frequent appeals to parliament, the propositions, some of which were literal extracts from the *Augustinus*, and others, as *Bossuet* very justly remarks, contained the *vital principles* of Jansenism, were condemned by Pope Innocent X. in the bull *Cum occasione*, dated May 31, 1653. This bull was acceptable to nearly all France, the Sorbonne giving the first example of submission, and even the defenders of the propositions yielding to the judgment of the Holy See, from motives of *ecclesiastical obedience*. Of the latter, however, some held that while the condemned propositions were in themselves heretical, they were not in fact contained in the book *Augustinus*, and hence could not be attributed to its author. This distinction between *right* and *fact* again revived the controversy, which, as we shall have occasion to show in the following epoch, grew more heated and acrimonious as time went on.

During the present epoch, a statement of a Franciscan, named *Francis de Santiago*, to the effect that the teaching of the Franciscan Order, relating to the *Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin*, had been positively confirmed by a vision granted to himself, occasioned the revival of the old controversy on this point between the Dominicans and Franciscans. So determined was the attitude of the Dominicans that *Philip III.*, King of Spain, felt it to be his duty to request a solution of the question from the Holy See. The reigning Pope, *Paul V.*, did no more, however, than republish the decrees of Sixtus IV., issued in the years 1476 and 1483, granting a proper "office" for the *Feast* of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and indulgences to those reciting the Divine Office or celebrating or assisting at Mass within the "Octave." He likewise commanded both parties to abstain from branding each other as heretics. While permitting the question to be discussed from a purely scientific point of view, Paul V. forbade it to be made the subject of controversial sermons, and his bull of 1621 ordained that no expression other than "*The Conception of the Blessed Virgin*"[2] should be used in either the

[1] I. Aliqua Dei præcepta hominibus justis, volentibus et conantibus secundum præsentes, quas habent vires, sunt impossibilia; deest illis quoque gratia, qua possibilia fiant. II. Interiori gratiæ in statu naturæ lapsæ nunquam resistitur. III. Ad merendum et demerendum in statu naturæ lapsæ non requiritur in homine *libertas a necessitate* (freedom from interior necessity) sed sufficit *libertas a coactione* (from exterior constraint). IV. Semipelagiani admittebant prævenientis gratiæ interioris necessitatem ad singulos actus, etiam ad initium fidei; et in hoc erant hæretici, quod vellent eam gratiam tallem esse, cui possit humana voluntas resistere vel obtemperare. V. Semipelagianum est dicere, Christum pro omnibus omnino hominibus mortuum fuisse aut sanguinem fudisse. The bull issued against them is found in the Lps. stereotyped edition of the Council of Trent, pp. 278-280. Hist. de propositions de Jansen (par *Hilaire Dumas*), Liége, 1699; Trévoux, 1702, 3 vols., 12mo.

[2] In the editiones Concil. Trident., by *Gallemart* and *Richter*, these bulls are appended to Sess. V., "de peccato originali." Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopædia, Vol. VI., pp. 865-872; Fr. tr., Vol. 25, p. 270 sq.

missal or the public offices of the Church. A second effort was made by both the contending Orders to obtain through Philip IV. a decision of the question from *Gregory XV.*, which the latter refused to give. *Alexander VII.*, when pressed for a similar decision, published a bull in 1661, in which, while referring to the decisions of his predecessors, he showed an unmistakable tendency to the doctrine of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin *without original sin.*[1]

In 1708 *Clement XI.*, made the Feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin one of obligation; and the learned Pope Benedict XIV. (1740-1758), summing up the arguments and decisions bearing upon the question, closed his treatise with these words: "While the Apostolic See does not as yet declare the Immaculate Conception of Mary to be an article of faith, it is nevertheless evident that the result of the discussion goes to show that the Church is favourable to the opinion."

§ 352. *Art still in the Service of the Church.* (Cf. § 293.)

†*Glareanus*, Dodecachordon, Basil, 1547. †*Gerbert*, De cantu et musica sacra a prima eccl. ætate usque ad præsens tempus, S. Blas., 1774, 2 T., 4to. *Rio*, L'art chretien, nouv. édit., Par., 1866, 4 T. *Rochlitz*, Outlines of a History of Plain Chant, Lps., 1832. *Kiesewetter*, Hist. of Music in Western Europe, Lps., 1847, 4to. For further bibliography, see § 293.

The strong hold which the faith of the Catholic Church and the splendour of her ceremonial still retained upon men's minds was strikingly illustrated in the efforts made by artists to give expression, though after a new fashion, to the thoughts they inspired. The revival during the fifteenth century of classic taste and the slavish imitation of the models of Greece and Rome, chiefly in the imitative arts, had largely contributed to estrange men's minds from the spirit of the Church. The new *style of church architecture* in Italy was the first expression of this vitiated taste. Even as early as the time of *Julius II.* there was a departure from traditionary *ecclesiastical* architecture in the construction of *St. Peter's* in Rome, after the designs of *Bramante*, which were based upon the classic Greek and Roman styles.[2] These designs were in the main carried out in its continuation and completion by *Raphael* and *Michael Angelo;* but the noble simplicity of the majestic structure, the grandest temple of the Christian world, was marred by the meaningless and incongruous *façade* of *Carlo Maderno*, which sensibly detracts from its splendid proportions and imposing effect. In spite, however, of its defects, St. Peter's was frequently taken as a model, and by degrees came to be accepted as the type of the so-called *Renaissance* style, a taste for which spread rapidly through France and Spain, the various countries of Germany,

[1] "Sane vetus est Christi fidelium erga ejus beatissimam Matrem Virginem Mariam pietas sentientium, *ejus animam in primo instanti, creationis atque infusionis in corpus fuisse speciali Dei gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum J. Chr. ejus Filii humani generis Redemptoris, a macula peccati originalis præservatam immunem*, atque in hoc sensu ejus Conceptionis festivitatem solemni ritu colentium et celebrantium."

[2] See p. 162.

particularly Bohemia, and through Belgium and England. Its debasement kept pace with its progress through these countries, and its *characteristics* were a tendency to depart from traditional ecclesiastical architecture and a slavish imitation of Greek and Roman details, which, having neither unity nor connection with the main design, gradually lost their signification, and degenerated into absurd contrivances for decoration. In France, this style, which was there known as that of Henry IV., and combined all the defects of the Classic and Gothic, without the merits of either, flourished mostly under Louis XIV. and his great-grandson. So destitute was it of all the principles of art, so offensive to good taste, and so absurdly fantastic in its decoration that, for want of a better word, it was expressively designated "*Rococo.*"

The introduction of the Renaissance in its most debased form into ecclesiastical architecture was prevented by what is known as the "*Jesuit style.*" Hence the churches of this period, though conforming to the general principles of Renaissance construction and exhibiting its uniform sameness of design, still preserve a certain stateliness and correctness of taste.

In *painting*, as in architecture, the learned efforts of the artists of that age to imitate *ancient* models were seriously detrimental to the dignified simplicity and religious inspiration of the earlier schools, though these qualities are not wanting in the works of *Correggio*, *Titian*, the three noble *Caracci*, *Domenichino*, *Guido Reni*, *Dolce*, *Caravaggio*, and *Salvator Rosa*, in Italy; of *Alonso Berruguate* († 1561), *Perez de Morales* († 1586), *Velasquez*, *Murillo*, and *Alonso Cano* († 1677), in Spain; of *Nicholas Poussin* († 1665), *Le Brun* († 1690), *Le Sueur*, and others, in France; of *Rembrandt* († 1674), *Rubens* († 1640), and *Van Dyke*, in the Netherlands; and of *Albert Dürer* († 1528), *Holbein* († 1554), *Christopher Schwarz*, *Joaquin Sandrart*, and others, in Germany.

Poetry, like the other arts, was still in the service of the Church. Breaking through the pedantic mannerism of the age, the muse of *Torquato Tasso* († 1595) took a nobler flight, and consecrated in heroic verse the chivalrous and religious exploits of the Middle Ages in his great poem, "*Jerusalem Delivered*" (*Gerusalemme Liberata*).[1] *Calderon de la Barca* († 1681), who, after having borne arms as a gallant soldier, became a priest and canon of Toledo, sang in sweet and graceful numbers of the heroism of Christians and the unfading crown of glory they shall receive on waking from "*the dream of this life.*" Much of his fertile dramatic genius and glowing religious enthusiasm was expended in illustrating in his "*Autos Sacramentales*," or "*Corpus Christi*," pieces the mysteries of the Christian religion. These dramatic productions, intended to be played in the open air on Corpus Christi Day and other feasts of the Church, were allegorical

[1] Transl. into German by *Streckfuss*, 2nd ed., Lps., 1835, 2 vols. The most complete edition of his work appeared at Pisa, 1821-1832, in 33 vols.

in character, being based on Scriptural events, but combining in their composition references to incidents related in the history of the people or consecrated in their folklore.[1]

Lope de Vega was a still more striking example of the same spirit and tendency. He led a roving life in his youth, and having, like Calderon, borne arms with distinction, he continued, even amid the distractions of military life, to pour forth poems with amazing rapidity. His imagination, though fertile and even exuberant, was correct, and his powers of production inexhaustible. It is said that, besides his other multitudinous performances, he was the author of one thousand eight hundred dramas. Nor was his genius wholly devoted to secular themes; his pen embellished the gravest subjects, and gave poetic expression to the most sublime ideas of religion. After the death of his second wife, he entered the Order of St. Francis, and in 1609 was ordained a priest. Towards the close of his days he felt happy only in the solitude of the cloister, and so terrific were his self-scourgings that the walls of his cell were frequently spattered with his blood, and the illness of which he died (1635) was occasioned by one of these bodily castigations.[2] Mention should also be made of *James Bald*, *Frederic von Spee*,[3] and *Angelus Silesius* (*John Scheffler*).[4] The last-named was born at Breslau in 1624, of Protestant parents, practised medicine in his early manhood, was converted to the Catholic Church when twenty-nine years of age, and afterwards studied theology and took priest's orders. He published a number of writings in defence of his new faith, and having lived an exemplary life as a religious man, died a holy death, July 9, 1677, in a convent of his native city. Of his religious poems, the collection most prized, alike by his contemporaries and by posterity, is that entitled "*Yearnings of the Soul*" (*Heilige Seelenlust*). These pieces were set to music by *George Josephi* musician in ordinary to the Bishop of Breslau, and published with his melodies in 1657.[5]

Music[6] continued in alliance with painting, sculpture, and poetry

[1] *Calderon's* (95) Autos Sacramentales or Corpus Christi pieces, in a German translation, with introductory remarks by *Lorinser*, Ratisbon, 1856-1872, 18 vols. Goethe and Schlegel have made Calderon popular in Germany. In Britain he is not well known, and in France not appreciated. (Tr.)

[2] A full account of Lope de Vega's life and writings will be found in *Tichnor's* History of Spanish Literature, N. Y., 1869. There is also a good essay on him in *Prescott's* Biographical Miscellanies, Boston, 1857. (Tr.)

[3] *Balde*, New ed. of his Carmina lyrica and Batrachomyomachia, Münster, 1856-59. *Spee*, Mock Nightingale (*Trutznachtigall*), published by Brentano, Berlin, 1817; also by Junckman and Hueppe, with melodies and an introduction, Coesfeld, 1841. Virtue's Golden Book (Güldenes Tugendbuch), Coblenz, 1829. *Smets*, Pious Hymns, by Spee, Bonn, 1849. Conf. *W. Lindemann*, Hist. of German Literature, Freiburg, 1866, p. 389 sq.

[4] *John Scheffler*, Complete Works, published by *Dr. Rosenthal*, Ratisbon, 1862, 2 vols. † *Wittmann*, Angelius Silesius as a Convert, Mystic Poet, and Controversialist, Augsburg, 1842.

[5] Heilige Seelenlust, being Spiritual Hymns, by *Angelus Silesius*, revised and published as a book of devotion, by W. Winterer and Sprenger, Mannheim, 1838; Stuttg., 1846.

[6] Cf. *Nicholas Wiseman's* Lectures on Holy Week, delivered in Rome, 1837. (German tr., by *Axinger*, Augsb., 1840).

during this epoch, contributing like these to spiritualize and elevate the ceremonial of public worship. The Flemings were, during the fourteenth century, the great masters of church music, and it was among them that the *modern* music first assumed the character of an art, capable of giving utterance to the high aspirations of the soul and the tender emotions of the heart. At first serious, expressive, and ennobling, it gradually degenerated into a dry, artificial, and learned style of music, owing chiefly to the fact that the Church, being unwilling to give up her time-honoured melodies, its advocates were forced to confine their talents to the harmonies, and as a consequence not unfrequently introduced into their compositions secular and profane airs, wholly inappropriate to the object for which they were intended.[1] Religious music had so far declined as to give occasion to serious complaints at the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII. and XXIV.), some of the Fathers even advocating its entire banishment from the service of the Church.[2] It was, however, saved by *Palestrina*, whose *genius* restored it to its true dignity. *Giovanni Pierluigi*, or *Palestrina*, a surname derived from the name of his birthplace, was born of poor parents in the year 1524. Even while still very young, his musical talents attracted the attention of a musician, by whom he was admitted into the cathedral choir of his native town. He there gave promise of future greatness, and at the age of sixteen went to Rome, where he studied music under Claude Goudimel. At the age of twenty-seven he was appointed director of music in the *Julian Chapel*, in St. Peter's, lately completed by Pope Julius III. It is said that Pope Marcellus II. suggested to the gifted young artist the idea of religious music, to which he gave such exquisite expression in the *Missa Marcelli*, published in 1555, during the pontificate of Paul IV. His famous *Improperia*, published in 1560, are not less sublime. These are sorrowful and tender reproaches, addressed, in the language of the Prophet Micheas (VI. 3 sq.), by our Divine Saviour to an ungrateful and heartless people, and are sung on Good Friday in Greek and Latin, together with the so-called *Trisagion*: "*Holy God, Omnipotent God, Immortal God.*" Dr. Burney calls Palestrina the Homer of religious music, and had he no claim other than the *Improperia* give him to the title, they would be amply sufficient to merit it. That he persuaded the College of Cardinals, assembled for the definite purpose of banishing modern music for ever from the service of the Church, to allow the compositions, which he submitted to them for examination, to be performed during divine service (1564), was not the least of his triumphs. Combining the stateliness of the Gregorian chant with the vivacity of modern melody, the compositions of Palestrina are also remarkable for the richness, the gravity, and the solemnity of their harmonies. Like all church music deserving the name, they are admirably adapted for choral singing.[3]

[1] *Mansi*, Vol. XXIX.. p. 107. (Tr.)
[2] Church Music and the Council of Trent (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 42).
[3] *Baini*, Memorie della vita di G. P. da Palestrina, Roma, 1828. 2 vols, 4to.

In the year 1533, *Luigi Dentice* composed a *Miserere*, which enjoyed a high reputation, until it was surpassed by the famous composition of *Allegri* upon the same subject. Called from Fermo to Rome by Urban VIII., he was appointed a member of the choir in the Sistine Chapel, a position which he held until his death in 1652. His most celebrated composition is his *Miserere*, still annually performed in the same chapel. It was originally written for two choirs, the one of five and the other of four voices, which sing alternate verses until the *Gloria Patri* is reached, when the nine unite and sing together till the close. The music of this famous composition expresses with wonderful power and sympathetic precision the calm, deep, and thoughtful sorrow that weighs upon the soul of the earnest Christian, seriously meditating on the Passion of our Lord, and the tumultuous yet subdued feelings that agitate his whole being, when contemplating the last scene of the tragedy on the heights of Calvary.

The movement was forwarded in Spain by *Morales*, and in Belgium by *Orlando di Lasso*, or Lassus, both of whom were mainly instrumental, each in his own country, in preserving the grave and religious character of church music, now seriously threatened by the operatic style lately introduced at Florence (about 1600) by some members of the Medicean Academy. With a view of directly counteracting the worldly spirit of the lyric drama, a new school of music, of which *St. Philip Neri* is regarded as the founder, was started in the Oratory at Rome. The compositions, taken as a whole, were called *Biblical Dramas* or *Oratorios*, from the place in which they were performed. The text, of which the subject was usually some scriptural incident or character, was, as a rule, partly epic and partly dramatic; and the music consisted of recitatives, airs, duets, trios, quartets, and choruses, with an orchestral or organ accompaniment. This sort of lyrico-religious drama was performed mostly during the Lenten season, and was singularly solemn and attractive.[1]

§ 353. *Religious Life.*

The fervent wishes for a true reformation in the Church, to which expression was so frequently given by the Fathers assembled in Councils during the course of the fifteenth century, and by other saintly and earnest men, were in a large measure realized during the period of which we are treating. But while, on the one hand, we congratulate ourselves on results so consolatory, on the other we should remember and frankly admit that they would not have been either so thoroughly or so speedily carried out had they not received an impulse from the unexpected and violent assaults of the pretended Reformers. If an age may be judged by the number of illustrious men, pious Popes, zealous bishops, sainted founders of Religious Orders, and learned doctors, which it produces, none in the whole

[1] Conf. *Fink*, Hist. of Musical Oratorios (Periodical of Hist. Theology, 1842, nro. 3).

history of the Church is more glorious than this. Among the more remarkable and better known are *St. Francis de Sales, St. Vincent de Paul, St. John of the Cross, St. Thomas of Villanova,*[1] *Bartholomew a Martyribus* (†July 16, 1590),[2] *St. Ignatius, St. Francis Xavier, St. Aloysius Gonzaga, St. Stanislaus Kostka.*[3] *St. Philip Neri, Blessed Lawrence of Brindisi,*[4] *St. John of God, St. Teresa, St. Joan Frances de Chantal, St. Angela* (Merici) *of Brescia,* and many more, nearly, if not quite so distinguished for saintliness of character and purity of life, all forming a catalogue of glorious names, to the least of which the Protestant Church did not produce a single one to compare. No faithful Catholic can pass in review so many patterns of heroic virtue and Christian perfection, or dwell even momentarily upon the life of so exalted a character as *St. Charles Borromeo,*[5] without feeling his faith strengthened and his courage animated.

Born October 2, 1538, of an illustrious family, at the Castle of Arona, the ancestral home of the house of Borromeo, Charles, even in infancy, gave such tokens of tender piety and religious zeal that a priest of Milan, forecasting his future, said of him: "This child will one day be a reformer of the Church, and accomplish great things." He studied laws at the University of Pavia, where he received the degree of doctor in 1559. His heart was so saddened and afflicted by the laxity and dissoluteness of the Benedictine monks of Arona, that, on the death of his father, he made up his mind to give himself wholly to the service of the Church. So remarkable was his virtue, and so great his capacity for business, that his uncle, Pope Pius IV., called him to Rome, and, despite his youth, appointed him to many important offices, and, at the age of twenty-two, created him cardinal and Archbishop of Milan (1560). While presiding as Legate over the government of Ancona, Bologna, and other cities within the States of the Church, he displayed unusual executive talents, and was equally distinguished for the ability with which he discharged the duties and offices connected with the government of the Church which were committed to him at Rome. Surrounded by luxury and magnificence, his deportment was grave, his life saintly, and his manners

[1] †*Maimbourg*, La vie de St. Thom. de Villeneuve, Paris, 1666. Life of Thomas a Villanova, by *F. W. Faber*, London, 1847. Latin Life by *Feigerle*, Aulic Chaplain, and subsequently Bp. of St. Hippolyt. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *Sion*, year 1841, Jn. nros. 10-13. His principal work, for the use of bishops, "Stimulus Pastorum," ed. first, 1572, at Rome; latterly by Bp. *Fessler*, at Rome, Paris, Madrid, and Brussels (Einsideln, New York, and Cincinnati), 1863. (Tr.)

[3] *Daurignac*, Hist. of St. Aloysius, trans. into German, by *Clarus*, Frkf., 1866. The Life of St. Stanislas Kostka, S. J., by *E. H. Thompson*, Philadelphia, 1870. (Tr.)

[4] Father *Schulenburg*, Life of Bl. Lawrence of Brindisi, Mentz, 1863.

[5] Opp. Carol. Borrom., Milan, 1747, 5 T., fol. Homiliæ et alia præfat. et annot. J. A. Saxii., Aug. Vind., 1758, 2 T., fol. Acta Mediolanensia; Noctes Vaticanæ; Sermones habiti in academia, Romæ in palatio vaticano instituta; Pastorum instructiones et epp., ed. *Westhoff*, Monast., 1846. An excellent Italian biography, by *J. P. Giussano;* trans. into French, by *Cloysault*, Avignon, 1824, 2 vols.; into German, by *Klitsche*, Augsburg, 1836, 3 vols. Vie de St. Charles Borromée, by *A. Godeau*, Paris, 1747. English Life, by *Edw. Healy Thompson*, London, 1858; *Touron*, La vie et l'esprit de St. Charles Borromée, Paris, 1751.

austere. Studious himself, he fostered a love of letters in others, and, after the exhausting labours of the day, was wont to spend his evenings discussing scientific and ethical questions with a number of scholars, clerical and lay, whom he gathered about him in the Vatican, and to whom he was a munificent patron. He was appointed Grand Penitentiary by Pius IV., who never undertook any affair of moment without having first consulted with his nephew. Having placed himself under the spiritual direction of *John Ribeira*, a saintly Jesuit, the wealth and beauty of his predestined soul became daily more conspicuous, and his life more holy. His indefatigable activity, much of which was exerted in holding provincial *councils* and diocesan *synods;* his influence at the Court of Rome and with the delegates attending the Council of Trent, and his zeal in restoring discipline in Religious Orders and in remodelling *ecclesiastical seminaries*, place him beyond all question at the very head of the reformers of the Church during this epoch.

So deep and tender was his charity towards others, and so great his own spirit of self-denial, that to give play to the exercise of both, he founded those numerous eleemosynary institutions which history has connected with his name. Severe towards himself, he was rigorous with the clergy of his diocese, teaching them both by precept and example to fully appreciate the dignity and excellence of their calling, and to realize in their lives the high standard of conduct which it demands. As for himself, his whole life was one continuous exemplification of the exalted virtues so befitting the priestly character. In his own person he exhibited to the world the rare example of one who, having commenced life amid the splendour of the purple and the highest ecclesiastical dignities, closed his days literally worn out with the exhausting and important labours of a self-sacrificing *pastor*, mourned by his people as by loving children who had lost the tenderest and most prudent of fathers (November 3, 1584).[1] A grateful posterity erected to the memory of the great archbishop a colossal bronze statue on the shore of Lago Maggiore, which seems even still to protect by its presence the land of his birth and the scenes of his youth.

The lives and examples of these saints and illustrious men exerted a powerful influence upon the masses of the people, whose progress in holy living was fostered and promoted by the various Religious Orders, whose members specially devoted themselves to the instruction of the laity, the education of children, the care of the poor, and the service of the sick. Of those who gave themselves with the most disinterested zeal to the training and instruction of youth, stimulated by no motive other than the purest charity, the Jesuits, the Piarists, and the Ursulines, not to mention others equally deserving, were conspicuous. The foolish and inhuman practice of trying persons upon charges of *witchcraft*[2] was successfully assailed by many writers

[1] *Sailer*, St. Charles Borromeo, Augsburg, 1824. *Dieringer*, St. Charles Borromeo and the Reformation of the Church in his Age, Cologne, 1846.

[2] Cf. § 283.

of name, such as *Herman Loeher;*[1] *Dr. Andrew Schweygel*, of Rheinbach, near Bonn; *John Freylink*, a Dominican, of Cologne; *Stapirius*, pastor of Hirschberg, in Westphalia; *Cornelius Loos*, of Mentz (†1593); the Jesuit, *Tanner* (†1632); and most effectively by Father *Frederic Spee.*[2]

In conclusion, it may be remarked that never in any age of the Church did the clergy labour more earnestly for the spread of religion and the cultivation of morals among the people than at the time when the Protestants cut themselves off from communion with the See of Rome, to which they were indebted for whatever of truth and religious conviction they still retained.

CHAPTER V.

RELATION OF CATHOLICS TO PROTESTANTS.

§ 354. *Attempts at Reconciliation.*

Hering, History of the Efforts at Reconciliation, made since the Reformation, Lps., 1836-38, 2 vols. *Neudecker*, The Principal Attempts at the Pacification of the Evangelical and Protestant Churches of Germany, Lps., 1846. Cf. *Gieseler*, Manual of Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 449 sq.

It is difficult to conceive how, possessing a knowledge of the events already related—the fierce conflicts, heated controversies, universal disorders, and the fruitless attempts, made both before and after the Council of Trent, to effect a reconciliation—persons, both Catholic and Protestant, should be found who still cherished the hope of bringing about a union between the Catholic Church and the Lutheran and Reformed sects. The very character of Protestantism, inasmuch as it affords no common ground upon which its advocates and opponents might base a compromise of this character, should have taught these well-meaning men that every such attempt was necessarily futile. When *Julius von Pflug*, as presiding officer of the Conference of Worms (1557), requested the Lutheran orators to confine the discussion to the *Augsburg Confession*, giving as a reason that it would be impossible for the Catholic theologians to follow them through all mazes of varying and shadowy systems, seven of the twelve present refused to accede to his request, thus putting an end

[1] *Loeher*, when an octogenarian, still wrote: Urgent, Humble, and Woeful Complaint of Pious and Innocent People, etc., Amsterdam, 1676.

[2] (*Fred. Spee*), Cautio criminalis seu de processibus contra Sagas liber ad magistratus Germ. hoc tempore necessarius, etc. (auctore theologo Romano), Rinthel, 1631, and frequently. Cf. *Jungmann*, Catholic Voices against Trials for Witchcraft, Raised at a Time when they were most in Vogue (*Cath. Magazine*, Vols. III. and IV., Münster, 1847-1848).

to the deliberations. But the perils arising out of these religious dissensions, and menacing both the social and political fabric, overruled the teachings of experience; and many good and wise men put forth their energies in the vain hope of reconciling and uniting the hostile parties. Of these, *Ferdinand I.* of Austria was particularly active.

George Cassander (†1566), pursuing a line of thought analogous to that drawn out by *Erasmus* in his "*De amicabili Ecclesiæ concordia*," published a work entitled "*Judicium de officio pii ac publicæ tranquillitatis vere amantis viri in hoc religionis dissidio*," in which he insists that to labour for union is a sacred duty of all Christians.[1] The movement was vehemently and energetically opposed by Calvin. Nevertheless, Ferdinand requested Cassander to draw out and publish his views on the subject (1564). This work, which made its appearance only after the death of the emperor, was entitled "*De articulis relig. inter Cathol. et Protestant. controversis ad imperatores Ferdin. I. et Maxim. II. consultatio.*" His views are as moderate as could be looked for under the circumstances, but the interpretations which he put upon Scripture and tradition, with a view to show that the Papacy is not of divine institution, are arbitrary in the extreme. His statements, while they seemed very like paradoxes to Catholics, found no favour with Protestants. *George Wizel*,[2] who, having gone over to Protestantism, again returned to the Church, had already published, with a similar purpose, a work entitled "*Regia via seu de controversis religionis capitibus conciliandis sententia*," basing his argument on the twenty-one articles of the Augsburg Confession. These attempts, as also those of *Frederic Staphylus*, of Osnabrück, one of Luther's disciples, and formerly professor at Koenigsberg; and of the Jesuit, *Adam Contzen*, of Cologne, in his "*Discursuum theologico-politicorum libri XIII.*," and "*De pace Germaniae*," utterly failed of the purpose for which they were intended.

Two religious conferences, the one at *Baden*, in 1589, and the other at *Emmendingen*, in 1590, both of them set on foot by *James*, Margrave of Baden, a recent convert to the Catholic Church, and having the same object in view, failed as utterly in establishing harmony as any of the efforts that had preceded them.[3] But so hopeful were the Catholics of bringing about a reconciliation that the aggressive and offensive conduct of the Protestants, on the occasion of the *centenary celebration of the Reformation*,[4] in 1617, could not shake

[1] Cf. *Meuser*, On Cassander, in Dieringer's Cath. Journal, year II., Vol. 3.

[2] Beside the work quoted above, Cologne, about 1564, ed. *Conring*, Helmst., 1650, 4to, we have to notice still: *Typus Eccl. Cathol.*, or Forms and Signs, which have guided and governed the Holy, Apostolic, and Catholic Church for a thousand years throughout Christendom; in five parts, Cologne, 1540. 4to. See *Döllinger*, Vol. I., p. 18 sq.

[3] What *Vierordt*, in his Hist. of the Evangelical Reformation in the Grand-Duchy of Baden (Carlsruhe, 1847, 2 vols.) but slightly touched upon, is fully detailed, in three articles of the Hist. and Polit. Papers, 1856, On the Conversion of the Margrave and the Two Conferences. Cf. *Raess*, Converts, Vol. III., p. 91 sq., and Freiburg Diocesan Archives, Vol. IV., pp. 89-122.

[4] *Werner*, Hist. of Apolog. and Polemical Literature. Vol. IV., p. 589 sq.

their courage or deter them from again repeating what had so often been proved to be little better than acts of charitable folly. Those who were now foremost in the movement were the Jesuits, *John Dez. Scheffmacher*, and *James Masenius*.[1]

In *France* attempts were likewise made by Cardinal Richelieu to unite religious parties, but more with a view to further his own policy than from disinterested motives. At his request, the Jesuit, *Audebert*, met *Amyraut*, the celebrated Reformed theologian, in conference, and made important concessions; but, fortunately, a compromise, which might have been the source of very alarming dangers, was prevented by the insuperable difficulties presented when the question of transubstantiation came up for discussion. *Francis Veron*, also a Jesuit, acting on a similar request, proposed a plan of union (*Methodus nova, facilis et solida hæreses ex fundamento destruendi*, 1619), the drift of which was that the Protestants should be required to demonstrate their principles and assertions from distinct passages of Holy Writ. He wrote another treatise, directed equally against *the extreme schools of Catholic opinion* and the false interpretations of Protestants.[2] Another work, "The Analysis of Faith" (*Analysis fidei*), by *Henry Holden* († c. 1665), was written for a similar aim, but failed of its purpose. The irenical work of *Bossuet* had a measure of success in certain localities.[3] Efforts equally earnest and equally fruitless were made by King *Ladislaus* IV. to secure religious union in *Poland*. Foreseeing the dangers that threatened his country, he was encouraged to prosecute his benevolent designs by the return to the Church of eminent scholars like *Berthold Nihus* and *Christopher Besold;* of distinguished preachers like *Bartholomew Nigrinus;* and by the publication, at Helmstaedt, of the writings of the celebrated *Hugo Grotius* and *George Calixtus*, in which they had expressed their doubts both as to the necessity of the schism and the wisdom of perpetuating it. Accordingly he opened a correspondence with the representatives of both parties, with a view to have them hold a religious conference at *Thorn*.[4] They also received an invitation of the same purport from *Lubienski*, Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland, who, in a letter dated November 12, 1643, wrote as follows:

It would seem that there are many points of contact and agreement on both sides. If each party will hold on to what is certain, clear up what is obscure, and verify what is plainly open to discussion, by the testimony of the Scriptures and the teaching of the

---

[1] *Werner*, Hist. of Apolog. and Polemical Literature, Vol. IV., p. 750 sq.

[2] *Francisci Verönii*, Regula Fidei s. secretio eorum, quæ sunt de fide cathol. ab iis, quæ non sunt de fide, Par., 1644, and often; Aquisgrani, 1842, 12mo; by *Smets*, in Latin and German, Elberfeld, 1843. Of a kindred spirit are the subsequent treatises by *Chrismann*, Regula fidei cath. et collectio dogmatum credendorum, denuo ed. *Spindler*, Wirceburgi, 1855, and by *Bossuet*, Exposition de la doctrine catholique, in many editions and translations. Collected in *Braun*, Bibliotheca regularum fidei, Bonnæ, 1844, etc., 2 T.

[3] See above, p. 381.

[4] Scripta facientia ad colloquium a Seren. et pot. Pol. rege Vladislav. IV. Toruni in Borussia ad. d. X. Octob. 1644, indictum, accessit *Georgii Calixti*, Consideratio et epicrisis, Helmstad., 1645. Cf. *A. Menzel*, L. c., Vol. VIII., pp. 102-128.

primitive Church, there will be no difficulty in finding out what is the Catholic truth; and having ascertained it, and brushed away whatever may have heretofore dimmed its lustre, all will be convinced that there was no adequate cause for the schism in the first instance, and no reason for perpetuating it now."

Ladislaus, learning that the dissidents took offence at language even so calm and temperate as this, sought to conciliate them by an appeal to their patriotism, their national traditions, and religious feelings. In an invitation addressed to them, bearing the date of March 20, 1644, he said:—

"One who can remain insensible in the presence of so protracted, so cruel, and so relentless a war, without putting to himself the questions, What has kindled such fierce hatred? Why so much blood shed? Why so great resources exhausted? must indeed be destitute of every noble feeling. Europe, shaken to her very centre, totters and reels under the accumulated weight of her misfortunes and her crimes. *Religious discord* alone has kindled among Christians a hatred so fierce that human prudence seems powerless to extinguish it. What the God of peace gave as a bond of union, the father of lies and the fomentor of discord has converted into a source of hatred, injustice, and distrust among men. It is our wish, therefore, to restore union to the body of Christ, rent by human opinion, and to re-establish religious peace, so long disturbed. While, on the one hand, the Church, like a solicitous mother, has left no means untried to secure this end; on the other, the untiring energy of the Polish intellect, and, still more, the spirit of Christian charity, have inspired me with the hope that, in the infinite mercy of God, what has been destroyed by the malice of the enemy may be restored, and what has been corrupted made whole. Are we not all children of the same Father? Have we not the same origin, the same baptism, the same name? Has not the same Church, washed in the Blood of Christ, given birth to us all? Are we not governed by the same laws that our fathers obeyed for centuries? Those whom brotherly love should bind together in union and harmony are divided and separated by prejudices of education and the artifices of the enemy of mankind. Hence we should put forth our best efforts to find a remedy for these evils, which we all deplore, and which sadden the heart of our Supreme Pastor. Heretofore learned writings have been published and special conferences held, but to no purpose; however, we may still be permitted to hope that opinions will be reconciled and peace restored by amicable discussion. The Church, like a tender and loving mother, appeals to you as to well-beloved children. Her age, her misfortunes, her wounds command your respect. She is more vigorous than the centuries; they have left the traces of age upon her, but she is still robust. Evil she overcomes by charity, and by patience heals her wounds. . . . There is one sorrow no art can soften—the pangs she suffers in having her children torn from her bosom by heresy and schism. She pines away in the expectant hope of seeing them again return from their wanderings. She observes the winds, rushes to the beach, stretches out her arms to the shipwrecked, calls out to them, beseeching them to come and take possession of the heritage of peace that has been lost to them for a century. Such also is our wish, such the tender prayer we extend to our separated brethren."

The desired meeting took place in October, 1645, at Thorn. The Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg sent their theologians, and, with the gracious consent of the Duke of Brunswick, *George Calixtus* was also present. But though a moderate and temperate man, Calixtus was not acceptable to Catholics, and because he was in favour of establishing amicable relations with the Reformed Church, extreme Lutherans, like *Calovius* and *Hülsemann*, shunned him as they might a plague. "To my amazement," wrote Calovius, "I have seen him seated in the midst of false Calvinistic prophets, whom he regards as his brothers in Christ." The temper of mind, which these words indicate, was not favourable to reconciliation. The Catholic cause was ably sustained by the Jesuit, Father *Schoenhofer*, who showed

very satisfactorily that the charges brought against the Catholic Church by Protestants had no foundation, in either her principles or dogmas, as truly set forth in authorized works, such as the *Decrees of the Council of Trent* and the *Roman Catechism*. This, like all other religious conferences intended to reconcile irreconcilable parties, had no effect other than to still further alienate Lutherans and Catholics, and to excite against George Calixtus the indignation of the extremists of his own sect.

§ 355. *The Thirty Years' War.*

Khevenhüller († 1650), Annales Ferdinandei, fr. 1578 to 1637, Viennæ, 1646, 9 T., fol., ed. II., Lps., 1721-1726, 12 T., fol. *Theatrum Europæum*, or Relation of all Memorable Events, fr. 1618-1718, Frankfort, 1643-1738, 21 pts. *Hurter*, Hist. of Ferdinand II. and his Parents, Schaffh., 1850 sq. *Caroli Caraffa*, Commenta de Germania sacra restaurata, Colon., 1639, along with about 200 Decreta diplomatica, &c. *Ginzel*, Legatio Apostolica Petri Aloysii Caraffæ (1624-1634), Wirceburgi, 1839. *Barthold*, Hist. of the Great German War, from the death of Gustavus Adolphus, with a special reference to France, Stuttg., 1842 sq., 2 vols. *K. A. Menzel* (New Hist. of Germany, Vol. VI.-VIII.) *Mailath*, Hist. of the Austrian Empire, Vol. III. *Onno Klopp*, Tilly in the Thirty Years' War, Stuttg., 1861 sq., 2 vols. *Gfroerer*, Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, and his Age, 4th ed., by Onno Klopp, Stuttg., 1863. *Koch*, Ferdinand III., Vienna, 1865. *Maurice Ritter*, Letters and Acts supplementary towards the Hist. of the Thirty Years' War. &c., Munich 1870, Vol. I. Cf. *Janssen*. Latest Researches on the Thirty Years' War (Tuebg. Quarterly 1861, pp. 532-568).

The expressions employed by Protestants in the various Religious Conferences when speaking of the Church, roused the passions and spoiled the temper of Catholics. To be constantly represented in Protestant controversial sermons and polemical writings as a superstitious, bigoted, and idolatrous class, and that, too, by those who knew better, increased their indignation. The ecclesiastical reservation article (*reservatum ecclesiasticum*) in the Peace of Augsburg (1555), inasmuch as it was constantly being violated, became a source of ceaseless trouble. In Northern Germany, where the violations of the Peace were of more frequent occurrence, the estates belonging to the sees of *Havelberg*, *Brandenburg*, *Naumburg*, *Meissen*, *Schwerin*, *Lebus*, *Camin*, *Magdeburg*, *Halberstadt*, *Minden*, *Verden*, *Bremen*, *Lübeck*, *Osnabrück*, and *Ratzeburg* were seized by the Protestants as occasion offered. For a time the Catholics offered no resistance, but when the elector, *Gebhard*, High Steward of Cologne (from 1577), after having long kept up criminal relations with Agnes, Countess of Mansfeld, and Canoness of Gerresheim, finally passed over to the Reformed Church, and attempted to involve his whole diocese in his apostasy, they made a determined stand for their rights. In 1583 Gebhard was deposed by the Holy See, and *Ernest*, Bishop of Liége, and a *Bavarian prince*, who had been appointed by the Chapter of Cologne, forcibly installed in his room. This proceeding, though sanctioned by the Peace of Augsburg, was loudly denounced by Protestants as iniquitous. While carrying out wherever they could the principle "*Cujus regio, illius religio*," they vehemently protested against the conduct of *Julius*, Bishop of Wurzburg (after 1555), and *Philip of Baden-Baden* (after

1571), who were only exerting themselves to bring their people back again to the Church. The abjuration of the Margrave of *Baden* and *Hochberg* was the signal for another shout of intolerant protest;[1] and the chorus, now pitched in a higher key, was swelled by the indignant voices of those who, witnessing the splendid triumphs achieved for the Church by the Society of Jesus, put forth every resource at their command to weaken, if not destroy, its efficiency. At *Donauwörth*, where the number of Protestants had largely increased, the Catholic magistracy was deposed; Catholic worship subjected to annoying strictures; and those in the procession of the Blessed Sacrament on Corpus Christi Day of the year 1606 violently assaulted. By decree of the Imperial Chamber and Aulic Council of Vienna, the city was laid under ban of the Empire. The decree was carried into execution by *Maximilian I., Duke of Bavaria*,[2] who seized the city, and, because of its inability to defray the expenses of the war, sequestered it. Notwithstanding the steady devotion of the inhabitants of *Aix-la-Chapelle* to the Catholic religion and its interests, the Protestants of that city, having called the Netherlanders to their aid, publicly exercised their worship and elected burgomasters to their own liking.[3] When, in 1581, an Imperial Commission set about restoring the former condition of things, the Protestants revolted, and recourse had to be had to armed force, in order to recover the property and possessions of Catholics. Similar means had to be employed at *Strasburg* to enforce the *reservatum ecclesiasticum* and frustrate an attempt to hand the city over to a Protestant bishop. The feelings of rancour and bitterness which these collisions necessarily occasioned, were still further intensified by the *policy of France*. With a view to weaken the House of Hapsburg, she was mainly instrumental in effecting the *Union* of the Protestant princes at *Ahausen* (May 4, 1608), of which *Frederic V. of the Palatinate*, became the head. To oppose this coalition, the Catholic princes, in the following year, formed the *League of Würzburg*, at the head of which *Maximilian* of Bavaria, both on account of his interests and by reason of his abilities, was very naturally placed.

The war was imminent, and had it not been for the assassination of *Henry IV.*, the leader of the Union, would have immediately broken out. Only a plausible pretext was wanting, and this was furnished

[1] The Earlier Lists and Biographies of Converts, from the beginning of Protestantism, by †*Hoenighaus*; Chronological List of the most remarkable Conversions from Protestantism to the Catholic Church, down to our own days, Aschaffenburg, 1837, and by *Rohrbacher*, Schaffhausen, 1844. These were followed by the most complete work on the lives of Converts, together with a statement of their apologetical writings, either in full or in substance. written by the Right Rev. Dr. *Raess*, Bishop of Strasburg, and entitled Converts since the Reformation, Freiburg, 1866-1872, 10 vols., and a supplementary volume.

[2] Baron *Aretin*, Hist. of the Elector, Maximilian I., Duke of Bavaria, from authentic sources, 1 vol., Passau, 1842. Conf., also, on Duke Maximilian I., the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., pp. 279 sq., 422 sq., 513 sq. *Schreiber*, Maximilian, the Catholic Elector, and the Thirty Years' War, Munich, 1868.

[3] *Fr. D. Haeberlein*, Modern Hist. of the German Empire, Vol. XI., p. 353; Vol. XII., p. 319. *A. Menzel*, L. c., Vol. V., p. 141 sq.

by the course of events in Bohemia. Protestantism had been slowly making its way into the hereditary territories of Austria, during the reign of Ferdinand I., and into Bohemia during that of Maximilian II., mainly through the efforts of the Utraquists, who, in going over to Protestantism, simultaneously revived the fierce fanaticism of the Hussites. The people, rising in revolt, entered into negotiations with foreign potentates, and in their diets boldly demanded religious liberty as a condition before contributing anything towards defraying the expenses of the wars against the Turks. Under the circumstances, Maximilian II. thought it prudent to grant to the *Lords* and *Knights* freedom of worship, which, *contrary* to stipulation, was extended to cities and market-towns. Again, the Protestants of Bohemia forced *Rudolph II.*, who gave more of his attention to the absurdities of astrology and alchemy than to the interests of the empire, to issue an imperial rescript,[1] granting freedom of worship to all Lords, Knights, and cities that had embraced Protestantism. Emboldened by these concessions, the Protestants under *Matthias* openly defied the imperial authority. The latter being without issue, Ferdinand II., grandson of *Ferdinand I.*, and heir-apparent to the throne, was crowned in 1617. Devoted to the faith and the interests of the Catholic Church, and alarmed by the seditious movements of the Protestants and their intrigues with foreign princes,[2] Ferdinand exerted himself to the utmost of his power to crush out Protestantism in his patrimonial territories of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, thereby drawing on himself the bitter enmity of the sectaries of Austria and Bohemia. By the rescript of Rudolph, Lords, Knights, and royal cities, but not the tenants of Catholic landlords, were authorized to build churches on ground belonging to Catholics. Hence, when the emperor ordered the church at *Klostergrab* to be destroyed, and that at *Braunau* to be closed, the former having been built by the tenants of the Archbishop of Prague, and the latter by those of the Abbot of Braunau, the *Utraquists*, as the Lutherans were now called, professing to regard this as a violation of the Imperial Rescript, made the matter the subject of a formal complaint to the emperor. Infuriated by the menacing tone of the emperor's reply, the memorialists, breaking through all the restraints of law and order, made their way into the royal castle at Prague (May 13, 1618), and, seizing the imperial counsellors, *Martinetz* and *Slawata*, its accredited authors, pitched them headlong out through the windows.

The members of the Diet, favourable to the Utraquists, acting upon the direction of *Count Thurn*, placed the supreme authority in the hands of a Regency of thirty directors, raised an army, and, as their first aggressive act, expelled the Jesuits. Assured of the sym-

[1] *Gindely*, Rudolph II. and his Age, 1600-1612, Prague, 1862 sq., 2 vols. (very important in all matters relating to the Thirty Years' War). The *same*, Hist. of the Grant of the Imperial Edict of 1609, Prague, 1858.

[2] The Struggle of Emperor Ferdinand against the Protestant States of Austria (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., p. 673 sq.; Vol. IV., p. 168 sq., p. 219

pathy of the Union, they attacked the cities still loyal to the emperor, penetrated into Austria, and on the death of the Emperor Matthias, discarding Ferdinand II., who had been a student of the Jesuits at Ingolstadt, and would have made any sacrifice to secure the triumph of Catholicity, elected as their king *Frederic V. of the Palatinate.* In the meantime, internal dissensions were dividing the members of the Union. *Hoé,* preacher to the Elector of Saxony, indignantly protested against the outrage of "surrendering the Bohemians a prey to the Calvinistic antichrists;" the aid from England promised by King James I. was not forthcoming; and misfortunes following rapidly upon the heels of each other, culminated in the disaster of White Mountain, where the Bohemians, under the lead of Frederic of the Palatinate, were defeated, November 8, 1620.[1]

War had also broken out in Germany. The cause of Frederic of the Palatinate was championed by the *Margrave of Baden-Durlach;* the *Count of Mansfeld;* and by *Christian, Duke of Brunswick,* Administrator of Halberstadt.[2] They were, however, no match for the brave and virtuous *Tilly,*[3] the General of the League, and the victorious hero of thirty-six battles, or for *Wallenstein,* the commander of the imperial troops, by both of whom they were repeatedly defeated.

The Palatinate, the hereditary States of Frederic, was taken from him, and, with the consent of the Electors, transferred to Maximilian, the heroic Duke of Bavaria (1623). Frederic's brother-in-law, Christian IV., King of Denmark, aided by James I. of England, marched to the scene of war at the head of his forces; was utterly defeated by Tilly, near *Lutter on the Barenberg,* in the territory of Brunswick (1626), and forced to conclude the Peace of *Lübeck* (1629), by which he bound himself never again to be a party to any confederacy formed against the Emperor of Germany. Encouraged by

[1] While the Protestants claimed that their defeat might be accounted for by the exhausted condition of the troops after a night's march, the Catholics ascribed their victory to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin. The picture carried during the battle is now at the church of Santa Maria della Vittoria in Rome, the titular church of the late Card. Rauscher, and is still regarded as miraculous. (Tr.)

[2] *Soeltl.* The Religious Wars of Germany (also Elizabeth Stuart, wife of Frederic V. of the Palatinate), Hamburg, 1841, 2 pts.

[3] Protestant historians uniformly represent Tilly as a type of cruelty and fanaticism, and rarely omit quoting the words put into his mouth by *Schiller,* to the effect that, after the capture of the city of Magdeburg, some officers of the League, witnessing the horrors perpetrated by the brutal soldiery, chiefly by Pappenheim's Walloons and the Croatian cavalry, and horrified at the terrible scene of carnage, ventured to remind Tilly that he might put a stop to it if he would. "Return," he replied, "in an hour, and I shall see what I can do; the soldier must have some reward for his danger and toils." See the works of *Fred. Schiller* (Historical, p. 143), tr. by the Rev. *A. T. W. Morrison,* M.A., London, 1872. (Tr.) A true account of the *conflagration of Magdeburg* is given in *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers,* Vol. 3, Vol. 11, Vol. 14, and Vol. 42, by *Heising,* Magdeburg not Destroyed by Tilly, and Gustavus Adolphus in Germany, Berlin, 1846. *Bensen,* The Fate of Magdeburg, Schaffhausen, 1842. A true and full characteristic account of Tilly has recently been furnished by Count *Villermont,* Tilly, or The Thirty Years' War (tr. fr. the Fr. into Germ.), Schaffh., 1860. *Onno Klopp,* Tilly during the Thirty Years' War, Stuttg., 1861 sq., 2 vols.

these victories, Ferdinand II. forbade any religion other than the Catholic to be practised within his hereditary States. He felt that he might do this with perfect justice, inasmuch as the Protestants were labouring to incite the peasants to insurrection (1626), and had expelled all Catholics from Silesia and Upper and Lower Austria. In compliance with the frequently expressed wish of the princes of the Catholic Church, demanding a settlement of the difficulties growing out of the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, the emperor promulgated, in the year 1629, what is known as the *Restitution Edict*, which, being based upon the principle of common law, "*that one must not be despoiled of his own*," is generally regarded as just. This Edict provided that the *status quo* of the Religious Peace of Passau should be re-established; that all ecclesiastical property should be restored; that *Catholic* and Protestant princes alike might establish and maintain their own religion in their respective States; and that Protestant subjects, who desired to emigrate, should be permitted to do so. Owing to some preliminary matters, which it was necessary to settle before putting the Edict in force, its execution was deferred until the year 1631.[1]

Gustavus Adolphus, King *of Sweden*, who had long been wanting an opportunity to turn the troubles of Germany to his personal advantage and the aggrandizement of his crown, and believing that the moment had arrived for active measures on behalf of Protestantism, now seriously threatened, immediately set about making preparations during this interval. The emperor had aided the Poles in their struggle against Sweden, and this Gustavus Adolphus professed to consider a sufficient pretext for declaring war. Assured of the sympathy and support of Richelieu, he marched at the head of a Swedish army into Germany in 1630. But, while pompously professing to seek only "the glory of God and the honour and well-being of Christians," his own proclamation to the Germans, *still extant*,[2] proves that his real object was to place a Protestant prince (his modesty forbade him to mention himself) at the head of the empire.[3] His entire conduct and policy show conclusively that this was his real design. With the aid of the Protestant princes, he gained an important victory over Tilly at Breitenfeld, near Leipsig (1631), and

[1] *Henke*, the Protestant Church historian, strangely calls this Edict of Restitution the *death-warrant of Protestantism in Germany*. Could not Protestantism maintain itself in Germany as Catholicism did in England and Ireland under much more trying circumstances? In Germany large portions of the confiscated lands were restored, which was not the case in England and Ireland. The objects covered by the Edict were the two archbishoprics of Magdeburg and Hamburg-Bremen, twelve bishoprics, and a large number of monasteries.

[2] Baron von *Aretin*, the illustrious author of "The Relations of Bavaria to Foreign Countries," Passau, 1839, has found this project. Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., p. 431 sq., 499 sq. **Droysen* (junior), Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, 1867-71, 2 vols.

[3] *Frederic von der Decken*, George, Duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg, being Documents Supplementary to the Hist. of the Thirty Years' War, according to original sources, derived from the royal archives of Hanover, Hanover, 1833-1834, 3 vols. There are found palpable proofs of the dishonesty of Gustavus Adolphus.

immediately took up his march for Bavaria. Tilly, who met him on the frontier of that country, at the Lech, and gallantly contested his passage, received a severe wound, of which he died at Ingolstadt twenty-five days later, April 20, 1632. His last words were: "In Thee, O Lord, have I put my trust; I shall not be confounded for ever."

The next step of Gustavus Adolphus was to force the citizens of Augsburg to take the oath of allegiance to the crown of Sweden. The States of the Elector Frederic of the Palatinate he now proposed to regard as *fiefs* of the same crown, and declined to reinstate that prince unless he would consent to hold them as such.

Gustavus Adolphus met his death at the battle of *Lützen*, in Saxony, November 16, 1632. Wallenstein's defeat here was chiefly owing to the superior discipline of his opponents. In the same engagement perished *Pappenheim*, the gallant commander of cavalry, whose last words were: "I die happy, knowing that the sworn enemy of my faith has also this day gone to his account."

Hardly had the danger which threatened Germany been, to all appearances, averted, when the *ambiguous conduct of Wallenstein*[1] and his assassination (Feb. 25, 1634), which is to this day clouded in mystery, still further complicated affairs. The Swedish generals, under the direction of *Bernard*, Duke *of Saxe-Weimer*, and subsidized by the French government, now prosecuted the war with greater energy and more marked success. Through the efforts of *Oxenstierna*, the Swedish chancellor, a confederation of the Protestant States was effected. So blunted had the sense of national honour become in the minds of those princes that they "*very humbly*" begged this parvenu to take the direction of the government into his own hands.

In 1634, the Emperor, Ferdinand II., defeated the Swedes near Noerdlingen, thereby detaching from the Protestant alliance the Elector of Saxony, to whom he was reconciled by the *Peace of Prague*, concluded in 1635. These events, however, only stimulated the efforts of Richelieu to restore the preponderance of the Protestants in Germany. The victories and reverses were pretty evenly divided, neither side gaining any very decided advantage. Never before had the thriving provinces of Germany been so desolated, and that, too, by the horrors of a civil and religious war, which an ambitious rival nation did its best to incite and protract. When the emperor died in 1637, it was thought these appalling horrors would cease, but through the perfidious policy of France, whose sordid interests were not yet satisfied, they were continued with undiminished atrocity under his son, *Ferdinand III.*, notwithstanding that he had published a general amnesty at the *Diet of Ratisbon* in 1641. From the year 1635 till its close the war was so obviously of a *political* character that *Hippolytus*

[1] *Baron von Aretin*, Wallenstein, being supplements towards a more precise view of his character, Passau, 1846. *Hurter*, Supplements towards a History of Wallenstein, Schaffh., 1855. By the *same*, The Last Four Years of Wallenstein's Life, Vienna, 1862. *Ranke*, Hist. of Wallenstein, 3d. ed. (Complete Works, Vol. 23rd).

a Lapide very justly reminded his contemporaries "that since they were fighting for territorial conquests, and not for their faith, they ought in decency to lay aside *the now meaningless pretext of religion*" (*vanus ille religionis prætextus*).[1]

Certain writers, yielding to the influence of some unaccountable fatuation, have endeavoured to make the world believe that the object of this war was the *freedom of Germany*, to which, in matter of fact, it was in no wise intended to contribute.

§ 356. *The Peace of Westphalia.*

I. Instrument. pac. Westph., ed. *Berninger*, Monast., 1648; ed. *Meyern*, Hanover 1734-1736, Götting., 1740, 6 T., fol. Supplements thereto, 3 T., fol., Götting, 1747. Documents of the Treaties of Peace of Osnabrück and Münster, according to authentic sources, Zürich, 1848. *Adam. Adami* (Envoy of Corvey), Arcana P. W., Francof., 1698, ed. *Meyern*, Götting., 1737.

II. *Pütter*, Spirit of the Peace of Westphalia, Götting., 1795. *Phillips*, Can. Law, Vol. III., pp. 462-477. *Struve*, Complete History of the Religious Grievances in the German Empire, Lps., 1722, 2 pts. *A. Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. VIII. Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, "The Peace of Westphalia," Vol. 51, year 1863.

Germany was exhausted, and longed for peace. While both parties were still in fierce conflict with each other, negotiations, looking towards a cessation of hostilities, were opened at Münster and Osnabrück (1645-1648). These were tedious, and were finally brought to a close only on October 24, 1648, when a Treaty of Peace was signed, and its execution guaranteed by *France* and *Sweden*, the two countries that had done most to ruin Germany. As a remuneration for their efforts towards this end, both received large grants of the territory of the Empire. Alsace, with the exception of the bishopric of Strasburg, was annexed to France; Upper Pomerania, the island of Rügen, part of Lower Pomerania, and the cities of Wismar, Bremen, and Verden were added to Sweden; and to both countries a war indemnity of five millions of thalers was paid. The losses of Brandenburg in Pomerania were compensated by the acquisition of the bishoprics of Magdeburg, Halberstadt, Minden, and Camin, as secular principalities; Mecklenburg, in exchange for Wismar, received the bishoprics of Schwerin and Ratzeburg; Brunswick, as a reward for sacrifices made to Sweden, obtained the monasteries of Kroeningen and Walkenried; and the good offices of Hesse-Cassel to the same country were repaid by the cession of the abbey of Hersfeld and other ecclesiastical estates. The change in the character of ecclesiastical property, once it had passed into the hands of civil princes, was now for the first time called "*secularization.*"

Owing to the *extravagant demands* of the Protestants, some trouble was experienced in adjusting the *religious difficulties*, but it was finally agreed that the articles of the Treaty of Passau and the Religious Peace of Augsburg should be strictly observed by both parties; that

[1] Cf. *Hurter*, Ferdinand II., Vol. IX., p. 220. *Onno Klopp*, Prejudiced Fabricators of German History, Freiburg, 1863, pp. 25, 52, and 302.

[2] A town in the province of Westphalia. (Tr.)

the adherents of each should enjoy *equal rights*, according to the constitutions of their respective States;[1] that in all Imperial Courts and deputations the number of members representing each religious party should be equal; that if the two parties should differ from each other in the Imperial Diet, the question should be settled by compromise, and not by ballot; and that the Calvinists, or members of the *Reformed Church*, should have precisely the same relations to Catholics as those professing the Augsburg Confession. But, while bringing peace to the States of the Empire, this Treaty introduced a wholly novel legislation. The inhabitants of the various States no longer enjoyed equal religious rights; and while in some countries Catholics, in others Protestants, were denied the rights of citizenship and freedom of worship, rights which were accorded even to Jews.

This condition of things was brought about by an article in the Treaty investing the *supreme rulers* of the States immediately connected with the Empire with the *right of reforming*[2] the religion of the counts and vassals residing within their *territories*. This *episcopacy of princes*, or the investiture of ecclesiastical powers so extensive in the hands of the civil rulers of countries, soon produced its legitimate results. At first the exercise of these powers was limited to the external organization of the churches (§ 336); but it soon passed far beyond these modest limits, and was stretched to a length to which neither popes nor bishops ever thought of carrying their authority or jurisdiction within the Catholic Church. Thus, for example, the inhabitants of the Palatinate, within the sixty years following the accession of Frederic III., were forced, at the bidding of their successive masters, to change their religion *four different times*.[3]

By a strange inconsistency, the so-called "right of reforming," granted to *princes*, was denied to *imperial cities*. It was ordained that these should preserve the dominant form of religion, and magistrates and citizens were politely informed that they must forego the right enjoyed by them since the breaking out of the Reformation, of regulating whatever pertained to religion. But, though princes possessed in theory the absolute "right of reforming," in practice it underwent many modifications and limitations.

The condition of affairs on January 1, 1624 (called the *normal year*), was to serve, as a rule, as regards the secularization of ecclesiastical property; so also was the free exercise of religion by Catholics under Protestants, and by Protestants under Catholic princes, to be based upon the existing relations at that fixed point of time. But, while the "right of reforming" was thus limited by the condition

[1] *F. M. Bachmann*, Nonnulla de regula æqualitatis ex § I., art. 5, pacis Westphal., Erford, 1792, 4to.

[2] Cum Statibus immediatis cum jure territorii et Superioritatis etiam *jus reformandi religionem* competat, conventum est, hoc idem porro quoque ab utriusque religionis Statibus observari, nullique Statui immediato jus, *quod ipsi ratione territorii et superioritatis in negotio religionis competit*, impedire oportere. (Instrum. Pac. Osnabr., Art. V., § 30).

[3] †*Remling*, The Work of the Reformation in the Palatinate, Mannheim, 1846.

existing at a certain date, there were still some important matters left unsettled. Thus, for instance, there could be no question as what the "right of reforming" meant, when applied to subjects or vassals of a different religion from the ruling prince, but the case was very different when they were of the same belief and members of the same church. In countries where the ruling princes were Catholics, there was of course no difficulty, since all Catholics hold that *ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction* are vested, not in secular lords or civil princes, but in the Pope and the bishops, and that, strictly speaking, the "right of reforming" can be exercised only by a particular or general council.[1]

By the provisions of the Treaty, the *Protestants* of both professions had an advantage over Catholics in the application of the "*reservatum eccleslasticum*," it being provided that all foundations and benefices in the hands of the former since January 1, 1624, should retain their Protestant character, even after they had passed under the authority of a Catholic prince.

Consistently with the condition of affairs in the same year, Catholic bishops were permitted to exercise jurisdiction over the *Catholic*, but not over the Protestant subjects of a Protestant prince, a limitation having been provided in the Recess of 1555. According to the now accepted principles of religious equality, the members of the Imperial Chamber were to be composed of equal numbers of Catholics and Protestants, but the emperor might put two Catholics into places in the Chamber, which it was his right to fill, and he had also the nominating of the four presidents. Against this article of the Treaty the Protestants protested, insisting that whenever measures affecting the rights of both parties came up for discussion, the Chamber should be divided into Senates, composed of *equal* numbers of Protestants and Catholics. Their demand was granted.[2]

As the Treaty contained many articles detrimental to the interests of the Catholic Church, *Fabio Chigi*, the Papal Nuncio, who was at Münster, acting as mediator between France and the emperor, protested against the *objectionable portions*, and called upon the representatives of the Catholic powers to bear him witnsss that he had had no hand in the making of the obnoxious instrument, and had neither signed it nor given weight to its contents by being present at the conferences. This protest was ratified by Pope *Innocent X.*, who, in his bull *Zelus domus Dei*, refused to acknowledge the articles hostile to the Catholic Church, declaring that whatever either or both

[1] Provincialia Concilia, sicubi omissa sunt, pro moderandis moribus, corrigendis excessibus, controversiis componendis aliisque ex sacris canonibus permissis renoventur. (Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIV., cap. 2, de reform.) Cf. Conc. Constant., Sess. XXXIX.

[2] Instrum. Osnab., art. V., § 54: Caesarea majestas mandabit, ut non solum isto judicio camerali causæ ecclesiasticæ ut et politicæ inter catholicos et acathol. status, vel inter *hos solos* vertentes, vel etiam quando catholicis contra catholicos status litigantibus tertius interveniens acathol. status erit, et vicissim quando acathol. statibus contra ejusdem confessionis status litigantibus tertius interveniens erit catholicus, adjectis ex utraque religione pari numero assessoribus discutiantur et dijudicentur.

of the Treaties contained injurious or prejudicial to the Catholic religion, the divine service, the salvation of souls, the Holy See, the Church of Rome, or other churches, or to ecclesiastical discipline or the clergy, he utterly rejected and pronounced null and void. While, on the one hand, he was sincerely desirous of abstaining from all troublesome interference in the new order of affairs; on the other, he did not wish to be regarded as shaping his policy to suit the exigencies of the times, or to surrender the *unchangeable principles* which have always guided the action of the Holy See.[1]

After the conclusion of this Peace, which annihilated the last vestiges of imperial power; severed the ancient ties that had united the several States; gave a preponderance to foreign influences in the affairs of the empire, and sowed the seeds of the perpetual discords, which at critical moments always broke out afresh, thus adding to the existing troubles, the antagonism of the opposing parties ceased to be political, *resuming again the religious character which it bore in its origin.*[2]

CHAPTER VI.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

§ 357. *The Greek Church under the Turks.*

M. le Quien, Oriens christianus, Par. 1740, 3 T., fol. *Heineccius*, Picture of the Ancient and Modern Greek Church, Lps., 1711, 4to. *Kimmel*, Libri symbolici eccl. Oriental., etc., Jen., 1843 (only expositiones fidei Turco-Graeciae!); append. add. *Weissenborn*, ibid., 1850. †*H. J. Schmitt*, Critical History of the Modern Greek and Russian Churches, Mentz, 1846. *Pichler*, Hist. of the Schism between the East and the West, Vol. I., pp. 420-438. *Pitzipios-Bey*, The Oriental Church (Germ., by *Schiel*, Vienna, 1857). *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopæd., Vol. IV., pp. 760-774; Fr. tr., Vol. 7, p. 247.

---

[1] For the true meaning and scope of this protest, cf. **Döllinger*, "The Church and the Churches," "The Papacy and the States of the Church," pp. 49-62. *Schmidt*, S. J., Institutiones Jur. eccl. Germ., P. I., pp. 83-93.

[2] The following observation of *Walter*, in his Manual of Canon Law, 13th ed., p. 628, is important: "The treaties of 1555 and 1648, considered as honest efforts to establish a durable peace between two contending religious parties, are not alone to be highly commended, but, from a political point of view, are wholly justifiable; because, in the then existing condition of affairs, there was no other available means of putting an end to the effusion of blood. But, considered from a legal point of view, they are violations of the rights of the Catholic Church. In the first place, foundations established for purely spiritual and very special purposes are not the property of individuals, but of communities and corporations. Hence, in cases in which whole communities did not embrace the new doctrines, either the estates should have remained in the possession of the Catholics, or a compromise should have been effected. Such, however, was not the case. Secondly: when the parties to the treaties disposed of property in actual possession, they made a conveyance, which, both in canon and civil law, required the sanction of either the ordinary of the diocese or the Pope. Thirdly and finally: by these treaties the contracting parties took upon them, *of their own self-constituted authority*, to dispose of bishoprics and chapters, and to regulate their internal affairs, an exercise which by ancient and recognized law required the authorization of the Sovereign Pontiff."

THE Catholic Church had made many sacrifices to better the condition of the Greek Church, which, since the fall of Constantinople, had felt the weight of persecution and experienced the humiliation of a degrading servitude. Immediately after the capture of the city, the Patriarch's cathedral was destroyed by order of *Mohammed II.*, and a Turkish mosque built on its site; while, during the reign of *Selim I.* (from 1512), the Christians were obliged to surrender their stone churches to the Turks and build others of wood for themselves; and, to crown all, the Sultan reserved to himself the right of appointing the *patriarchs*. *Gennadius*, although appointed to the *patriarchate* of *New Rome*, by Mohammed II., was commanded by the same authority to lay down the dignity; and the urgent entreaties of his faithful flock could not alter the decision of the tyrant. In like manner Mohammed sent *Joasaph*, the next occupant of the patriarchal office, into exile, for refusing to sanction an unlawful marriage of a Mohammedan minister to a daughter of an Athenian prince.

The patriarchate itself was often simoniacally obtained. A farcical election was held, the electors being twelve neighbouring archbishops, acting under the direction of a Greek, in the pay of the Sultan, and never failing to give their votes to the candidate who had offered the highest price for the office. The patriarch-elect was then conducted into the seraglio during the session of the Divan, when he received a costly robe of white silk embroidered with gold, a white charger, and a staff bearing an ivory head, as tokens and insignia of his office. At the close of the ceremony, he paid over a heavy purchase-money, and received from the sultan a letter of approbation (*berat* or *barath*). What with forced resignations, exile, degradation, and strangulation, the patriarchs of Constantinople were seldom able to maintain themselves for any considerable length of time on the throne. From the patriarch the practice of securing their offices by simony passed down through all the inferior grades of the clergy, and, having obtained them in this way, *archbishops*, bishops, and priests alike never failed to indemnify themselves for what the purchase had cost them.

The Mohammedan conquerors thought it prudent, from political considerations, to show a semblance of respect for the external form of the old Greek Church; and hence, besides the patriarch of Constantinople, those of *Alexandria* (at Cairo), of *Antioch* (at Damascus), and of *Jerusalem*, were still permitted to exist. The *patriarch of Constantinople*, being the head of the whole Orthodox Church, styled himself *Ecumenical Patriarch*. The archbishops, holding the next rank in the Greek hierarchy, were chosen by the patriarch of Jerusalem and his synod; and the bishops received their appointments from the archbishops.

As a class, the clergy were illiterate and immoral; took no interest in the welfare of their people; were destitute of every priestly virtue, and showed no disposition to sacrifice themselves in labouring for the religious and social amelioration of their flocks. After that the sultan had conferred upon the clergy certain privileges special to

their order, thus drawing a sharp line of distinction between them and other Christian subjects, the condition of the latter was most humiliating. Their taxes were vastly heavier than those paid by the Mohammedans; they were deprived of every right and shorn of every privilege, and nothing was left undone that might humble the pride and crush the spirit of these degenerate Greeks. So mean-spirited and craven had the clergy become that they had not the courage to protest against the methods employed for recruiting the *Janizaries* (Jeni-tsheri, new soldiers), a military force serving as a bulwark to Islamism, and composed of Christian prisoners and those who as children had been taken from their Christian parents and brought up in the faith of Mohammed.

It was not long before the Christian population lost all power of resistance. Their feeble condition was nowhere more apparent than in *Albania*, where the number of Christian inhabitants decreased between the years 1620 and 1650 from 350,000 to 50,000 souls. Among the vast multitude of apostates were to be found many monks and secular priests.

Their condition was somewhat improved at the opening of the eighteenth century, when Peter the Great of Russia (after 1711), *acting from motives of self-interest*, proclaimed himself the protector of the sultan's Christian subjects. His words received practical expression from Catharine II., who insisted on having Article VII. inserted in the peace of Kutshuk-Kainardji, thereby exacting from the Sublime Porte a promise that the Christian religion should be protected and its churches exempt from violence; and empowering the Russian ambassador to take cognizance of all violations of this part of the treaty.

§ 358. *Relations of the Greek Church to the Lutheran, Calvinist, and Catholic Churches.*

Leo Allatius, De Eccles. occidental. et oriental. perpetua consensione, lib. III., cap. 11 See Vol. II., pp. 322 and 584. **Hefele*, Tuebing. Quart. Review, 1843, pp. 541 sq and by the *same*, Supplements to Ch. Hist., Vol. I., pp. 444-447.

At first sight it should seem that there could be no possibility of a union between the Greek Church and the Lutheran, so widely different are the fundamental principles of each. Nevertheless, efforts were made in that direction, first by *Joasaph II.*, patriarch of Constantinople (1555-1565), who sent the deacon, *Demetrius Mysius*, to Wittenberg to obtain a knowledge of Protestantism at its very cradle. He received from Melanchthon a Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession, by *Dolscius*, and a civil letter for the patriarch, containing expressions of joy, in that "God had preserved the Eastern Church, surrounded by enemies so numerous and so hostile to the Christian name;" and conveying to him the assurance that "Protestants had remained *loyal* to Holy Writ, to the *dogmatic decrees of the Holy Synods*, and to the teachings of Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, and the

other *Fathers of the Greek Church;* that they rejected and abhorred the scandalous errors of Paul of Samosata, of the Manichæans, and of all heretics *anathematized* by the Church; that in the same way they cast aside all manner of superstitious practices and idolatrous worship, *introduced by ignorant Latin monks;* and that, therefore, if the evil reports put in circulation against the Protestants should come to his ears, he should not credit them."[1] The patriarch was too clear-sighted to be duped by these apparently candid avowals, and accordingly sent no answer.

A short time after, the Tübingen theologians, *Jacob Andrea* and *Crusius*, forwarded by Baron *David von Ungnad*, a zealous Protestant, whom the Emperor *Maximilian II.* sent as ambassador to the Sublime Porte, a communication to the patriarch, *Jeremias II.* (1574-1581), as remarkable for duplicity and bad faith as that of Melanchthon. The patriarch, after some delay, sent an answer, emphatically repudiating the teachings of Protestantism, specifying such tenets as that man is justified *by faith alone;* that there are but *two* Sacraments; that the *Saints* are not to be invoked; and also the Catholic doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds *from the Father and the Son.* In conclusion, he warned his correspondents against adopting new teachings, and repudiating those contained in the Bible, *the seven Holy Synods, and in the writings of the Fathers;* and begged them to hold whatever the Church holds, *whether that be her written or unwritten teaching.* The theologians sent a reply, explaining and controverting, as occasion required, to which the patriarch rejoined, requesting them for the future to spare him any further *annoyance* of a controversial character (1581), and entreating them to give up errors at once contradictory of Christian truth, and calculated only to draw down upon those who hold them the chastisement of heaven.[2] Another effort was made by *eleven* of the distinguished Protestant theologians of Würtemberg to continue the correspondence, but to their specious plans for a union of the Churches the patriarch did not deign to reply. A last effort was made by the indefatigable Crusius, who considerately translated into Greek, for the use of the Eastern clergy, a sufficient number of Lutheran sermons to fill four folio volumes; but the *Greek Synod* of Jerusalem (1672) very unfeelingly characterized his labours and those of others in a similar field as the impertinent and obtrusive officiousness of the Lutheran theologians of Tübingen.

The attempt made to bring about an understanding between the Greek and Reformed Churches must seem still more extraordinary. The first to undertake the difficult task was *Cyril Lucaris*, a native

[1] In *Crusius*, Turcogræcia, p. 557.

[2] Acta et scripta Theologor. Wirtemb. et Patriarch. Jeremiæ, Vitebergi, 1584, 4to. It is proper to draw attention to the fact that the letters which compromise the Lutheran theologians are wanting in this collection; but they may be found in *Crusius*, Turcogræcia. Cf. *Schelstrate*, Acta eccl. orient. contra Lutheri hæresin. Romæ, 1739; *Schnurrer*, De Actis inter Tübing. theolog. et patriarch. Constantinop. (Oration. acad., ed. *Paulus*, Tüb., 1828; *Hefele*. Suppl. to Ch. Hist., Vol. I., pp. 445-460.

of Candia (ancient Crete), then belonging to the Republic of Venice. He was educated at Padua, but coming, in the course of his travels, to Geneva, he entered into close relations with the Reformed theologians, and, on his return to Greece, became very much attached to *Meletius Pega*, patriarch of Alexandria, by whom he was ordained, and who was one of the most furious enemies of the Church of Rome. Having become protector of Poland, Meletius placed Cyril over the school of *Wilna*, in Lithuania, and the latter, taking advantage of his position, set himself to do his best to break off the negotiations then going forward with a view to a union of the Russo-Polish bishops of the Greek rite with the Roman Church. After the death of Meletius, Cyril succeeded, it is said, by bribery, in having himself placed upon the patriarchal throne of Alexandria (1602). He at once opened a correspondence with *Coruelius van Hagen*, the Dutch ambassador at Constantinople, and a zealous Calvinist, laying before that functionary a plan for making the Greek Church Calvinistic. The diplomatic agents of England and Sweden entered warmly into the scheme, and, in consequence, Cyril began to correspond on the subject with a Dutch preacher named *John Uytenbogaert*, and with *George Abbot*, Archbishop of Canterbury. To the latter he even sent a young and promising Greek, named *Metrophanes Kritopolos*, who, after having studied Protestant theology in England, was to spend some time in Germany on his way home. The letters that passed between Cyril and another of his correspondents, the Dutch statesman, *David le Leu de Wilhelm*, are singular productions. Finally, after many unsuccessful intrigues, Cyril reached the object of his ambition, when, in 1621, he was transferred to the *patriarchal see of Constantinople*. It is said that *Neophyte II.*, the last occupant of the see but one previously to the accession of Cyril, had, from the opening of the seventeenth century, favoured a union of the Eastern with the *Roman* Church, and that the *Jesuit* missionaries resident at Constantinople had entered actively into the project. Cyril, though banished to the island of Rhodes for his explicit avowal of Calvinistic principles, was a man of too fertile a genius to lose heart in the hour of disaster, and, to effect his recall, he made a lavish but judicious expenditure of money, an agent which he uniformly employed and always found potent to accomplish his designs. To further his purposes, he established a printing-office at Constantinople in the year 1627; and, by duplicity and the aid of unscrupulous friends, finally succeeded in ridding himself of the annoying presence of the Jesuits. In their stead, the Genevese sent (1628) him *Anthony Léger*, a Reformed preacher, who laboured zealously for eight years to Calvinize the Greek Church, but with indifferent success. In 1629, Cyril drew up *in Latin* a *Calvinistic* Confession of Faith (*Confessio fidei*), which he subsequently caused to be translated into *Greek* and scattered among the people (1631). The Greek bishops at once took the alarm. Cyril had again to endure persecutions and to go into exile (1634); but again he purchased his return by bribery, and in 1637 was reinstated without being obliged

to abjure the teachings of the "*Most Holy*" Calvin. But now the indignation of both clergy and people against *the man*, who dared to set up his own private opinions in room of the common belief, and to destroy the ancient reputation of the Greek Church for orthodoxy, could no longer be restrained. He was judged and condemned as a heretic by a synod held at Constantinople, and being, moreover, suspected of favouring an invasion of the Turkish empire by the Cossacks belonging to the Greek Church, was strangled by order of the Grand Seigneur, and his body cast into the sea. His Confession was condemned and anathema passed upon himself by a synod held at Constantinople shortly after (September, 1638). Among those condemned with Cyril was *Metrophanes*, Patriarch of Alexandria, whom the former had sent to England. But the heretical opinions of Cyril continued to live and spread after their author had passed away. They were frequently condemned by his successors, and by many synods, of which that presided over by *Dositheus*, Patriarch of Jerusalem, was the most important (1672).[1]

To prevent any further attempts to unite the Greek with the Reformed Church, the Greek bishops were required to subscribe to a Confession of Faith, drawn up by *Peter Mogila*, Archbishop of Kiew. This Confession, which sets forth the fundamental and unchangeable teachings of both the Greek and the Latin Churches, is vigorous and precise in language, and practical rather than speculative in character, differing in this respect from former subtle and ambiguous formulas of faith. It also contains a summary of the teaching concerning the three theological virtues of Faith, Hope, and Charity.[2]

In spite of the alienation existing between the Greek and Latin Churches, naturally resulting from the failure of so many attempts at union, the conversion of a large number of Greeks inspired fresh hopes, and with a view to facilitate a reconciliation, Pope Gregory XIII. founded at Rome a college for the education of young Greeks,[3] who, on their return home, were to labour to restore their countrymen to unity. One of these, *Leo Allatius*, was a native of Chios, and though only a layman, filled several important clerical positions, both at Rome and Naples (after 1610), and distinguished himself by his active zeal; but his efforts, like those of so many others, were fruitless. The wall of separation between the Greek and Latin Churches is broader and deeper than would appear at first sight, and has been mainly built up by the characteristics peculiar to the formation and development of each.[4]

[1] Synodus Jerosolymitana adv. Calvinistas hæreticos, interprete Domno M. F., ed. II., Par., 1678. Monuments authentiques de la relig. des Grecs par *J. Aymon*, or Lettres anecdotes de *Cyr. Lucaris* et du concile de Jérusalem, La Haye, 1708, 4to. On the other hand, Abbé *Renaudot:* Contre les calomnies et faussetés du livre intitulé: "Monuments," Par., 1709. Cf. *Hefele*, Suppl. Vol. I., pp. 463-476; and *Pichler*, Patriarch Cyril Lucaris and His Age, Munich, 1862.

[2] Orthodoxa conf. cath. atque apost. Eccles. orient., ed. *Hoffmann*, Vratisl., 1751.

[3] See § 344, p. 437.

[4] For his works, see Vol. II., page 322, and page 584, note 2. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I., p. 168 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. I., p. 163; and *Gengler*, The Principle of Faith in the Greek Church, Bamberg, 1829. See *Tüb.* Quart. Review, year 1831, p. 652 sq.

§ 359. *The Græco-Russian Church under its own Patriarchs.*

For Lit., see § 357. *P. Rycaut*, The Present State of the Armenian and Greek Churches, London, 1679. *A. N. Murawieff*, Hist. of the Church of Russia, transl. (in Russian, Petersburg, 1838) by *Blackmore*, Oxford, 1842. *Strahl*, Supplem. to the Ch. H. of Russia, Halle, 1827. *Ullmann*, On Strahl (Stud. and Critic,, 1831, Pt. II.) Lettres sur les offices divins de l'Eglise d'Orient, traduities du Russe, Petersburg, 1837 (Germ. by *Muralt*, Lps., 1838). Russian Studies on Theology and History, ed. by *M. Brühl*, Münster, 1858 sq. *Philaret*, Hist. of the Church of Russia (transl. into Germ. by *Blumenthal*, Frankfort, 1872, two parts). †*Jno. Fr. Henry Schlosser*, The Eastern Orthodox Church of Russia and the European West, Heidelberg, 1845. *Pichler*, Hist. of the Schism, etc., Vol. II. *Wallace's* Russia, New York, 1877.

The Russian, being the daughter of the Greek Church, has been, like the parent, hostile to the Catholic Church, and destitute of all spiritual life. The Russian Church, however, did not remain long dependent upon the Greek. The geographical situation of Russia, the peculiarities of her political structure, her interests always antagonistic to those of the Greek Empire, and, as time went on, to those of the Turks also, early tended to withdraw her Church from dependence upon that of Constantinople. Hence, when the capital was transferred from Kiew to Moscow, so was the Metropolitan See also. The pre-eminence of this see may be said to have been formally recognized when, at a conference of all the Russian bishops of Moscow, *Jonas*, the appointee of the Grand Duke, was declared *Metropolitan of Russia*. The Russian Church, however, was still in a measure dependent upon that of Constantinople, as is evident from the fact that the Metropolitan, *Isidore*, accompanied the Greek bishops to the Council of *Florence*, held for the avowed purpose of bringing about a union between East and West; but an important step towards complete separation had been taken, and the fall of Constantinople (1453) did but hasten an event which was certain to take place sooner or later. Moreover, in the measure in which the ties binding the Russian Church to that of Constantinople were loosed, in the same measure did the influence and authority of the Grand Duke in ecclesiastical affairs increase. Hence, in the sixteenth century, the *Tsar Ivanovicz* made an attempt to render the Church of Russia wholly independent, by investing one of his bishops with the *patriarchal dignity*.

The Tsar found a pliant instrument of his will in Jeremias II, Patriarch of Constantinople, who, having come to Russia in 1585, and being very much in need of money, participated in a synod, in which he gave his consent that *Moscow* should be regarded as the *third Rome*;[1] that *Job of Rostow* should be appointed its *Patriarch*; and that the governing body of the Russian Church should consist solely of four metropolitans, six archbishops, and eight bishops (1588). The Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, sixty-five metropolitans, and eleven Greek archbishops approved of this organization. But, while

[1] *Karamsin*, Vol. IX., p. 181. (Tr.)

the Russian Church as such was practically distinct from the Greek and independent of it, the Muscovite Patriarchs continued, until the year 1657, to request the Patriarchs of Constantinople to confirm them in their office. Finally, in the year 1660, the Russian envoy at Constantinople obtained from the Patriarch, *Denys II.*, and other Greek Patriarchs, a formal authorization, empowering the Russian clergy to choose their own Patriarchs, and dispensing with the confirmation of the election by the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Considered, both from a *political* and religious point of view, the office of Patriarch of Moscow from this time forth assumed a national character, grew in importance, and increased in influence. Those who held it were naturally regarded as persons of great consideration, and so powerful did they become, that at the end of the seventeenth century, when their authority was most respected, they roused the apprehensions and excited the jealousy of *Peter the Great.*[1]

Some efforts were likewise made to bring about a union between the Russian Church and the Roman, chiefly by Leo X., Clement VII., and Gregory XIII.[2] The Tsar, *Ivan Wassilievicz* (1533-1584), having been defeated by the Poles, and, anxious to secure the assistance of the emperor and the mediation of the Pope, with a view of conciliating them, professed a desire to be reconciled with the Church of Rome (1581). Eager to turn the favourable dispositions of the Tsar to the best account, Gregory XIII. sent *Anthony Possevino*,[3] a Jesuit, to Russia as his representative. A conference was held, at which Ivan assisted; but having learned that the articles of the treaty of peace were unfavourable, he broke off the negotiations, and all hopes of union were extinguished. The efforts of this accomplished Roman diplomatist were more successful in some of the Russian provinces, which, together with Lithuania, passed under the dominion of the Poles.

As the Patriarchs of Moscow had uniformly manifested an unfriendly spirit to those of Kiew, the latter were by no means desirous of continuing in the obedience of the former. Hence *Rahoza*, Metropolitan of Kiew, who had suffered exceptional indignities at the hands of the Patriarchs Jeremias and Job, proposed to the bishops of his province to unite with Rome. A synod was held at *Brzesc*, at which a formal act of union was drawn up (December 2, 1593). In obedience to the decision of a second synod, a deputation was sent to Rome, and a union effected on the basis of the Council of Florence, and on condition that certain concessions should be made in favour of ancient usages.[4] This happy event was announced by Pope

[1] Cf. below, § 385.

[2] Condition of the Catholic Church of both rites in Poland and Russia, from Catharine II. to our own days, etc., by *Augustine Theiner*, Priest of the Oratory, Augsburg, 1841, 2 vols. The second volume consists of documentary proofs.

[3] *Ant. Possevini*, Moscovia, Viln., 1586; Antv., 1587.

[4] Jura et privilegia genti Ruthenæ cath. a Max. Pontificibus Poloniæque Regibus concessa, Lemberg, 1787.

Clement VIII., in the bull "*Magnus Dominus et laudabilis.*"[1] He also confirmed the Metropolitan for the time being in the exercise of the rights of jurisdiction attached to his office (February 23, 1596), which included the appointment and confirmation of bishops for the dioceses within his province, on condition, however, that the Metropolitan himself should, through the Papal Nuncio in Poland, ask for his own confirmation from the Holy See.

Notwithstanding the fierce persecution raised against the unionists by the Ruthenian Patriarch, the bonds uniting Kiew to Rome were still more closely drawn, under the Metropolitan, *Rudski* (1613-1625), to whom *Paul V.* granted permission to send four young men to the Greek college lately founded in the Holy City (1615).

On the other hand, in the year 1633, *Peter Mogila* was elected orthodox Metropolitan of Kiew, and approved by Ladislaus IV., who, dreading the latinizing influence of the Roman monks in the schools established to promote the union, assumed the control of both the common and higher education of the orthodox community. In order to confirm the members of the Oriental Church in their own belief, and to strengthen their hostility to all encroachments, whether from a Catholic or Protestant quarter, he composed a *Russian Catechism* (1642), which was accepted by all the associated Patriarchs of the Greek Church as containing the teachings of the Oriental Catholic Church.

§ 360. *The Monophysites and Nestorians.*

Renaudot, Hist. Alexandrinor. patriarchar. Jacobitar., Paris, 1712, 4to. *J. J. Assemanni*, Dissert. de Syris Nestorianis. Cf. *Raynald.*, Ad an. 1553, nro. 43 sq.; an. 1562, nro. 28 sq. See the Journal *Morgenland*, year V., 1842.

The sects which originated in the Nestorian, Monophysite, and Monotholite heresies, and withdrew from the obedience of the Oriental Church, have ever since continued to drag out a miserable existence. Communities of Monophysites, commonly called *Jacobites*, are scattered here and there in considerable numbers over Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylon. They have a special Patriarch of their own, to whom they render obedience, and under him are a primate and several archbishops and bishops. There are also Jacobites in *Egypt*, where they are called *Copts*, and are subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople. They are likewise quite numerous in *Abyssinia*[2] and *Armenia*.

Many attempts have been made by the Catholic Church to bring back these erring children to the unity of faith. The only considerable success achieved, however, was in the case of the Abyssinians,

[1] Cf. the important work of the Polish Jesuit, *Piotr. Skarga*, o jednosci Kosciola Bozego pod jednym Pasterzem : i o Greckiem i Ruskiem od tej jednosci odstapieniu (dedicated to Sigismund III.), Warsz, 1590; and *Theiner*, Pt. I., p. 95 sq., and Pt. II., pp. 12-36.

[2] *La Croze*, Hist. du christ. d'Abyssinie, La Haye, 1739; Danzig, 1740. *Schnurrer*, De Eccles. Maronitica, Tüb., 1810 sq., Pt. II., 4to. Cf. *Ami de la religion*, new series, 1841, p. 750.

who, having received timely and efficient succour from the Portuguese in their struggle against the Mohammedans, in 1525, were favourably disposed to listen to overtures. Through the efforts of Father *Bermudez* and the Jesuits, the Emperor *Seltam Seghed* was induced to break off relations with the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria (after 1607), after which he, together with his step-brother and the most considerable men of his court, solemnly entered the Catholic Church (1626). He recognized the Jesuit, *Alphonso Mendez*, as Patriarch, and the Bishop of Rome as Head of the Universal Church. But the popular discontent evoked by this measure, and assiduously encouraged by the monks and hermits, grew daily more threatening, and culminated in an insurrection, which continued into the reign of *Seghed Basilides* (from 1632), by whom the Patriarch and the Jesuit missionaries were expelled the country, and all relations with Rome broken off (1634).

The Catholic Church was also in a measure successful in her missionary labours among the *Armenians*,[1] among whom there had always existed a more ardent faith and a greater love of learning than among any of the other Oriental sects. To the Armenians belong the religious body known as the *Mechitarists*, a name derived from the Abbot *Mechitar* (i. e., Comforter) *da Pietro*. Born at Sebaste, in Armenia Minor, in 1676, Mechitar was brought up under the care of an Armenian priest, and early developed a great love for study and a preference for the quiet of cloistral life. Led to Europe by a desire of knowledge, he experienced the trials and disappointments common to men in the pursuit of learning under difficulties; but the enthusiasm he brought to his task, and the hope of realizing a project he had for some time entertained, of establishing a literary academy for the Armenian nation, bore him up in his moments of depression, and carried him forward when his heart was light. In 1701 he founded at Constantinople a religious community, whose members were to devote themselves specially to diffusing a knowledge of the ancient language and literature of Armenia. He subsequently removed to the Morea, but forced, in consequence of the war between the Turks and Venetians, to surrender (1715) the convent he built (from 1703) on that peninsula, with so much toil and trouble, he withdrew to the small island of *San Lazzaro*, near Venice, on which he once more established himself and his community (1717-1740).[2] His monks, to whom he gave the rule of St. Benedict, encouraged by the example, and emulating the zeal of their founder, devoted themselves to the

[1] †*Steck*, The Liturgy of the *Catholic* Armenians, transl. fr. the Arm. into Germ., and put in comparison with other ancient liturgies, especially those of SS. Basil and Chrysostom, Tüb., 1844.

[2] The convent bears the following inscription, written in the Latin and Armenian languages: "Fuit hoc monasterium totum tempore Petri Mechitar ex Sebaste primi Abbatis exstructum an. 1740." See the description of a visit made to the establishment of San Lazzaro of the Mechitarists, and the Life of Mechitar, in *Illgen's* Hist. and Theol. Review, 1841, pp. 143-168. Cf. *Boné*, Le Convent de St. Lazare à Venise, ou Histoire succincte de l'Ordre des Méchitaristes Arméniens, Paris, 1837.

work of translating and publishing in excellent editions the Armenian classics in the languages of the West, and similarly the classics of the West in the language of Armenia. These labours they continued after the death of Mechitar, in 1749, and they have since established communities in *Vienna* (1811) and *Paris*.

The *Maronites* (Monothelites ?) of Mount Lebanon, on the establishment of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem in the twelfth century, entered into communion with the Church of Rome; but when that kingdom was destroyed, two centuries later, they ceased for a time to have any intercourse with Western Christendom. Their relations to the Holy See were again renewed at the Council of Florence (1445), and perfected in the latter half of the sixteenth century, when a college was founded at Rome (after 1584) for the education of their clergy. In this and their home-college of *El Chasir*, the Maronites labour zealously and perseveringly, but with no attempt at display, to cultivate and promote the various branches of Eastern and Western learning. Although in union with Rome, they are permitted to have their own Patriarch; to use the ancient Syriac language in their liturgy to communicate in both kinds; and their clergy, if married before taking priest's orders, may retain their wives. As a proof of their complete union with the Latin Church, the Maronites, at a *plenary council*, held in 1736, formally subscribed the *Decrees of the Council of Trent* in the presence of the Papal Legate.

The *Nestorians* or *Chaldean Christians*, called in East India *Christians of St. Thomas*, are governed by two Patriarchs, one of whom resides in a convent near *Mosul*, in Mesopotamia, and the other at *Ormia*, in Persia. The former has uniformly styled himself *Mar Elias*, since the year 1559; and the latter, since the year 1575, has similarly styled himself *Mar Simon*. Their churches were once spread over Tartary, India, and even China. Efforts were made by Popes Pius IV. and Paul V. to restore them to the common centre of Christian unity. A great schism took place in their body in the sixteenth century, when those in the obedience of the Patriarch of Ormia returned to the unity of the Latin Church.

END OF VOL. III.

I. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE

POPES AND THE ROMAN EMPERORS,

Being a continuation of Vol. II., p. 587

POPES.	EMPERORS.
Bl. Benedict XI., 1303, 1304.	
POPES OF AVIGNON (Frenchmen).	
Clement V., 1305-1314.	Henry VII., 1308-1313.
John XXII., 1316-1334.	Louis the Bavarian, 1313-1347, and Frederic of Austria, 1314-1330.
Benedict XII., 1334-1342.	
Clement VI., 1342-1352.	Charles IV., 1347-1378.
Innocent VI., 1352-1362.	
St. Urban V., 1362-1370.	
Gregory XI., 1370-1378.	
POPES AT ROME AND AVIGNON.	
Urban VI., 1378-1389.	Wenceslaus, 1378-1400.
(Clement VII., at Avignon, 1378-1394).	
Boniface IX., 1389-1404.	Rupert of the Palatinate, 1400-1410.
(At Avignon, Benedict XIII., 1394-1417).	
Innocent VII., 1404-1406.	
Gregory XII., 1406-1409.	
Alexander V., 1409-1410, elected by the Council of Pisa.	Sigismund, 1410-1437.
John XXIII., 1410-1415, deposed by the Council of Constance, May 29, 1415; so, likewise Benedict XIII., April 1, 1417, and Gregory XII., resigned voluntarily.	
Martin V., 1417-1431.	
Eugene IV., 1431-1447 (Felix V., Anti-pope, 1439-1448).	Albert II., 1438, 1439.
Nicholas V., 1448-1455.	Frederic III., 1440-1493.
Calixtus III., 1455-1458 (a Spaniard).	
Pius II., 1458-1464.	
Paul II., 1464-1471.	
Sixtus IV., 1471-1484.	
Innocent VIII., 1484-1492.	
Alexander VI., 1492-1503 (a Spaniard).	Maximilian I., 1493-1519.
Pius III., 1503.	
Julius II., 1503-1513.	

POPES.	EMPERORS.
Leo X., 1513-1521.	
Hadrian VI., 1522-1523 (a Netherlander).	
Clement VII., 1523-1534.	Charles V., 1519-1556.
Paul III., 1534-1549.	
Julius III., 1550-1555.	
Marcellus II. (only 21 days).	
Paul IV., 1555-1559.	Ferdinand I., 1556-1564.
Pius IV., 1559-1565.	Maximilian II., 1564-1576.
St. Pius V., 1566-1572.	
Gregory XIII., 1572-1585.	Rudolph II., 1576-1612.
Sixtus V., 1585-1590.	
Urban VII. (13 days).	
Gregory XIV. (10 months and 10 days).	
Innocent IX., 1591 (a little more than 2 months).	
Clement VIII., 1592-1605.	
Leo XI. (27 days).	
Paul V., 1605-1621.	Matthias, 1612-1619.
Gregory XV., 1621-1623.	Ferdinand II., 1619-1637.
Urban VIII., 1623-1644.	Ferdinand III., 1637-1657.
Innocent X., 1644-1655.	

II. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE

MOST IMPORTANT PERSONAGES AND EVENTS DURING THE SECOND PERIOD (700-1517).

SECOND EPOCH (1073-1517).

PART SECOND.

(FROM THE DEATH OF BONIFACE VIII. TO THE WESTERN SCHISM, 1303-1517.)

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1305-1314. Popes of Avignon. Benedict XI. succeeds Boniface VIII. (1303-1304), and after a short reign is followed by Clement V., who, in his servile submission to Philip the Fair, gives up his own see to reside at Avignon, which becomes the residence of the Popes from 1309 to 1378. *The Captivity of Babylon. Libri V. Clementinarum* are added to the *Corpus Juris.* Dolcino, leader of the Apostolicals, is burned to death in 1307. Duns Scotus (*Doctor Subtilis*) († 1308).

1311-1312. *Fifteenth Œcumenical Council of Vienne.* The Templars are abolished at the instance of Philip the Fair. The Fratricelli, Apostolicals, Beghards, and Beguines are condemned, and provisions made for promoting the study of oriental languages. Reformatory canons.

1316-1334. John XXII. His *twenty Extravagantes* and *seventy-four Extravagantes Communes* are distributed in five books. The latter are received into the *Corpus Juris.* Louis of Bavaria (1313-1347) triumphs over his rival, Frederic of Austria (1322). Quarrel between Louis and John XXII. Benedict XII. (1334-1342) and Clement VI. (1342-1352). Louis is excommunicated in 1324. An impassioned discussion ensues between Marsilius of Padua († 1328) and John of Jandun († after 1338). William Ockham († 1350); Leopold of Bamberg († 1354); Augustine Triumphus (1328); Alvarus Pelagius († shortly after 1340); the Dominican, Durandus of St. Pourçain († 1333). Andronicus III. Palæologus, Greek Emperor (1328-1341).

1338. Meeting of the Electors at Frankfort and Rhense. Nicholas de Lyra († 1341).

1346-1378. Charles IV., Emperor. Louis of Bavaria († 1347). Clement VI. (1342-1352) is succeeded by Popes Innocent VI. (1352-1362), Urban V. (1362-1370), and Gregory XI. (1370-1378). Cola de' Rienzi, the tribune of the people, re-establishes the Roman republic (1347). John Tauler († 1361). Henry Suso (*Amandus*) († 1365). Wickliffe disquiets England in 1360.

1377. The Return of Gregory XI. to Rome, which is effected by the united efforts of the Franciscan, Pedro, St. Bridget, and St. Catharine of Siena. Petrarca († 1374). John Ruysbroch († 1381).

1378-1409. Papal Schism. Popes in Rome and Avignon at the same time.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1386. Baptism of Jagello, Grand-Duke of Lithuania. Gerard Groot of Deventer, founder of the Clerics and Brothers of the Common Life († 1384). Nicholas de Clemange (1386) and Peter d'Ailly (1389) lecture in Paris. Henry of Hessia, or of Langenstein, lectures in Vienna (1384). Gerson becomes chancellor of the University of Paris in 1395.

1408. The Councils of London (1382) and Prague condemn the errors of Wickliffe. John Huss, preacher in the city of Prague, from 1402, joins the Wickliffites (c. 1406).

1409. Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. are deposed by the Council of Pisa, which appoints Alexander V. (1409-1410) to be their successor. Alexander V. is not universally acknowledged, and the inevitable result is the increase of the hitherto existing evil—three Popes instead of two. Peter d'Ailly; Gerson.

1410-1437. Sigismund, Emperor; John XXIII., Pope (1410-1415). Huss in a no less violent than turbulent manner inveighs against the indulgence granted by the Pope to all who might engage in the crusade against Ladislaus of Naples. He writes a book entitled "*Tractatus de Ecclesia*," and is in consequence excommunicated. The writing of the book and the sentence of excommunication both took place in 1413.

1414-1418. *Œcumenical Council of Constance.* A protracted and animated discussion arises whether the Pope is superior to the Council or not. The three Popes, John XXIII., Benedict XIII., and Gregory XII., are deposed, and Martin V. is chosen as lawful Pope in their stead (1417-1431). John Huss is burned at the stake on the 6th of July, 1415, being declared an obstinate heretic. Jerome of Prague shares a like fate on the 30th of May, 1416. Instead of a reformation "*in capite et membris*," Concordats are entered into with several nations; there are, however, several important canons bearing on general reform. St. Vincent Ferrer († 1419).

1423. The Council of Pavia is transferred to Siena on account of a pestilence. The results of this Council are insignificant. The Hussites split into Calixtines and Taborites, after the death of Huss, in 1419. John Ziska († 1424). Peter d'Ailly, Archbishop of Cambrai († 1425); Gerson († 1429).

1431-1449. Eugene IV. enters into negotiations with the Greek Emperor, John VIII., Palæologus, at Constantinople, Ferrara, and Florence (1425-1448).

1431-1449. *Council of Basle.* It is continued by that of Ferrara, held in 1438, and that of Florence, in 1439. Strange conduct displayed at the Council of Basle. Nicholas of Cusa publishes his work "*De Concordantia Catholica*;" he breaks with the Basilians, as does also Æneas Sylvius.

1438. Albert II., Emperor. Second Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. The death of Nicholas de Clemange occurs about this time.

1439-1448. John de Turrecremata and Nicholas of Cusa defend Eugene IV. in the diet of Electors and States-general. They again defend him in 1441. Nicholas of Cusa, for the third time, pleads the cause of the Pope, at Frankfort, in 1442. Emperor Frederic III. (1440-1493) and the majority of the princes declare in favour of the Pope and against the Council of Basle. The new diet, in 1446, is followed by the concordat of Aschaffenburg, in 1448.

1453. Capture of Constantinople by the Turks. A new impetus is given to the revival of classics by the fugitive Greeks, who, at the same time, undermine the prevailing religious spirit. The most celebrated amongst them, Bessarion, formerly Archbishop of Nice, dies in 1472, as Cardinal-Bishop of Tusculum. Lorenzo Valla († 1457), Paolo Cortesio, Marcilio Ficino, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Pietro Pomponazzo, and Angelo Poliziano, are contemporaries. Hellenism produces its desired effect in the school of the Brothers of the Common Life in the Netherlands. Nicholas of Cusa († 1464), Rudolph Agricola, Erasmus, etc.

1458-1464. Æneas Sylvius ascends the throne of St. Peter, as Pius II. He exerts his influence to arrest the further progress of the Turks in Europe, and with this end in view convokes a Council at Mantua (1459), which, however, is not attended by the wished-for results.

1464-1471. Pope Paul II. He is carried away by a love for pageantry and extravagance, but at the same time opposes the pagan tendency of the newly introduced studies. He persecutes Platina and Pomponio Leto, the disciple of Lorenzo Valla. In 1470, the epoch of the Jubilee is fixed at every twenty-fifth year. Thomas à Kempis dies in 1471.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1471-1484. Sixtus IV. John Goch († 1475) and John Wessel († 1481), reformers. In the kingdoms of Castile and Leon, Torquemada holds the position of Inquisitor-general (1483-1498).

1484-1492. Innocent VIII. Jerome Savonarola comes to Florence in 1489.

1492-1503. Questionable pontificate of Alexander VI. Maximilian, Emperor from 1493 to 1519. Execution of Savonarola, at Florence (1498).

1500. Efforts of Bartolomé de Las Casas in America. The University of Wittenberg established in 1502.

1503-1513. The short pontificate of Pius III. is followed by the warlike reign of Julius II., who, though bent upon enlarging his territories, shows himself a rigid observer of the ecclesiastical spirit.

1510. Death of the great preacher, Gailer of Kaisersberg. Luther goes to Rome for the purpose of negotiating the affairs of his Order.

1512-1517. The Council of Pisa is followed by the *Fifteenth Œcumenical*, or Fifth General *Council* of Lateran, which is opened by Julius II., on the 10th of May, 1512. Austere views of the General of the Augustinians, Giles of Viterbo. Leo X., in his interview with Francis I., at Bologna, in 1515, contents himself with the conclusion of a concordat, and terminates the Council on March 16, 1517, whereupon, the general of the Dominicans, Thomas de Vio of Gaëta, shows signs of intense indignation, and predicts that the greatest evils would ensue.

1514-1517. Several very useful works, written with a view to aid the study of Holy Writ, and numerous translations of the entire Bible, especially in German, appear about this time. Cardinal Ximenes († 1517), publishes his polyglot Bible.

THIRD PERIOD (1517-1878).

FIRST EPOCH (1517-1648).

1513-1521. Pope *Leo X.*, in 1517, has an indulgence preached in behalf of the erection of St. Peter's Church. The Dominican, *Tetzel*, preaches the indulgence in the States of the Elector and Archbishop of Mentz.

1517. On the 31st of October, Luther, preacher and professor at the University of Wittenberg, affixes ninety-five propositions on indulgences to the doors of the church. A reply, written by the Dominican, Sylvester Prierias, appears shortly after.

1518. In the month of April, on the occasion of the meeting of a General Chapter of the Augustinians at Heidelberg, Luther freely avows anti-Catholic propositions, forming the foundation of his subsequent teachings, and wins over to his cause Bucer, Schnepf, and Brenz; he comes, later on, before the Diet of Augsburg, presents himself before Cardinal Cajetan, and appeals from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope better instructed. The Pope appoints Pro-magister Gabriel General *pro tem.* of the Augustinians. At Danzig the monk, James Knade, preaches in the spirit of Luther.

1519. Death of Emperor Maximilian. Frederic the Wise is appointed Regent of the Empire. Luther presents himself before Miltitz at Altenburg. Disputation at Leipzig (June 27 to July 16) between Eck, Carlstadt, and Luther. Notwithstanding Eck's victory over Luther, the latter wins over to his cause Melanchthon, and also the turbulent and dissipated nobles of the times (Ulrich von Hutten, Francis of Sickingen), whom he professes to regard as angels sent for his service. Olaf and Lawrence Peterson create an agitation in Sweden in favour of Lutheranism. In Switzerland Zwingli opposes Bernard Samson, a preacher of indulgences. Charles V., Emperor, 1519-1556.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1520. Papal bull of excommunication against Luther. Dr. Eck and the Papal Legates, Carraccioli and Aleandro. Luther publishes inflammatory religious and political writings, such as the "*Address to the Christian Nobles of Germany;*" "*On the Babylonish Captivity;*" "*On Christian Liberty;*" and "*Against the Bull of Antichrist;*" and, finally, on the 10th of December, he burns, together with the papal bull, the Canon Law, many scholastic and casuistical works, and the controversialwritings of his adversaries.

1521. Luther comes before the Diet of Worms; decree issued against him; his retirement to the Castle of Wartburg (Patmos). *Loci theologici* of Melanchthon. Disturbances at Wittenberg, occasioned by Carlstadt, Storch, Thomas Münzer, and others.

1522. Luther declares against the Visionaries of Wittenberg. Brenz preaches Lutheranism at Hall, in Suabia. Henry VIII. publishes a work against Luther. The writings of the latter are spread through Hungary and Transylvania.

1522-1523. *Hadrian VI.* His declaration at the Diet of Nürnberg through his Legate, *Chieregati*, and his View of Luther. Bucer and Capito preach Lutheranism at Strasburg. Disputation at Zürich (January, 1523) between Faber and Zwingli, in consequence of which the latter wins over to his side Leo Judæ and Hetzer. Margrave Albert of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, invites the Lutheran preachers, John Brismann and Peter Amandus to come into his States. The Bishops of Samland and Pomesania publicly join their party in 1524. In Sweden, Gustavus Vasa avails himself of Lutheranism to obtain his ends. Bugenhagen, preacher at Wittenberg.

1523-1534. *Clement VII.*, Pope. His relations to the Emperor Charles V. and Francis I., King of France.

1524. Weakness of the Diet of Nürnberg at the moment of its close. Catholic alliance between Austria and Bavaria, participated in by twelve bishops of Southern Germany. Violent quarrel between Luther and Carlstadt on the Eucharist. Scene in the Black Bear Inn of Jena. Controversy between Luther and Erasmus on Free Will. Establishment of the Order of Theatines by Caraffa.

1525. The Peasants' War spreads throughout Germany. Base conduct of Luther and Melanchthon on this occasion. Continuation of the Controversy with Erasmus on the Eucharist. Luther marries, and arbitrarily abolishes the Canon of the Mass. Death of Frederic the Wise. John the Constant Eck publishes his *Enchiridion locorum communium adv. Lutherum*, and Zwingli his *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione.*

1526. Lutheran alliance of Torgau. Religious conference of Homburg. Denmark declares in favour of Lutheranism, in consequence of the intrigues of Christiern II. (1513-1523) and Frederic I. Margrave Albert marries the daughter of the King of Denmark. Secularization of the Duchy of Prussia.

1527. Capture and plunder of Rome by the Imperialists. Diet of Odensee in Denmark. Hypocrisy of Gustavus Vasa at the Diet of Westeraes. At Basle, the adherents of Œcolampadius obtain through menaces the free exercise of their worship. The Antwerp Polyglot published by Catholics.

1528. Berthold Haller preaches the new doctrines at Berne. Parochial visitation in Saxony. The Order of Capuchins is confirmed by Pope Clement VII. The *German Theology*, written by Bishop Berthold, of Chiemsee. Patrick Hamilton burned in Scotland for having there propagated heretical teachings.

1529. The Assembly of Œrebro accomplishes the work of Reformation in Sweden. Diet of Spire, where the Reformers receive the name of *Protestants.* Conference of the Lutherans at Copenhagen.

1530. Diet of Augsburg. The *Augsburg Confession*, composed by Melanchthon, to which Faber, Eck, and Cochlæus oppose a Catholic refutation. Melanchthon's *Apologia.* Establishment at Milan of the Order of Barnabites, which is confirmed in 1532.

1531. League of Schmalkald entered into by the Protestants. Zwingli and Œcolampadius perish during the war of religion, which breaks out in Switzerland. Matthias Devay preaches in Hungary, first Lutheranism, and soon thereafter Zwinglianism.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1532. Religious peace of Nürnberg. Death of John the Constant, who is replaced by John Frederic the Magnanimous.

1533. Shameful disorders of the Anabaptists at Münster. Negotiations in behalf of a General Council.

1534. Henry VIII. separates from Rome, because the Pope refuses to sanction his adulterous marriage. Luther publishes a complete translation of the Bible, at which he had been working since 1522. Oath of supremacy. Thomas Cranmer is appointed vicar-general. Calvin at Basle.

1534-1549. *Paul III.*, Pope. His efforts, through his Nuncio, Vergerius, to assemble an Œcumenical Council.

1535. The disorders of the Anabaptists put down at Münster. The Reformation is established at Geneva, through the efforts of Farel and Viret.

1536. Death of Erasmus at Basle. Calvin publishes his "*Institutes of the Christian Religion*," *dedicated to Francis I., King of France*, and establishes himself at Geneva. Bucer and Melanchthon conjointly bring about the *Concordia Vitebergensis*. Pope Paul III.'s encyclica, calling an Œcumenical Council to convene at Mantua in 1537, is unsuccessful.

1537. The Protestant Assembly of Schmalkald carries its hatred of the Pope to the very verge of frenzy. The twenty-three "Articles of Schmalkald" present a striking contrast with the Augsburg Confession. Melanchthon's treatise, entitled *De potestate et primatu Papæ*. Angela de' Merici ("of Brescia") founds the Order of Ursulines. Bugenhagen, Superintendent-General of Saxony from 1536, repairs to Denmark, crowns the King and the Queen, and succeeds in establishing the Reformation. Antinomian controversy between Luther and Agricola, 1537-1540.

1538. The *Holy League* of the Catholic Princes is formed through the efforts of *Held*, Vice-Chancellor to the Emperor. Calvin is driven from Geneva on account of his violence.

1539. Death of Duke George of Saxony. Henry, his brother, successor, establishes Lutheranism by force in his States. In Brandenburg Lutheranism is similarly introduced by Joachim II., whose character is in striking contrast with that of his illustrious father, Joachim I.

1540. The Pope confirms the Society of Jesus, founded by Ignatius of Loyola, who thus opposes a barrier against Protestantism. Religious Conferences at Spire, Haguenau and Worms. The Father of the Reformation allows polygamy to the Landgrave of Hesse.

1541. Religious Conference and *Interim* of Ratisbon. Julius Pflug, Bishop of Naumburg; and John Gropper, of Cologne; Melanchthon, Pistorious, and Bucer.

1542. St. Francis Xavier sets off upon his mission to India. Death of Cardinal Contareni. Death of Eck in 1543.

1545-1563. Œcumenical Council of Trent, which, notwithstanding several interruptions, is continued under Paul III., Julius III., and Pius IV. Its aim, practical reform, which it did much to accomplish.

1545. During the Diet of Worms, the Protestants once more refuse, in language unusually coarse and violent, to take any part in the proposed Council, and distribute to the Catholic deputies copies of Luther's work entitled, "*The Papacy an Institution of the Devil.*"

1546. On the 18th of February, Luther dies at Eisleben. The Elector Herman of Cologne encounters the most determined opposition to his design of introducing Lutheranism in his States, and is at length deposed. Diet and Conference of Ratisbon.

1547. Commencement of the Schmalkaldic War. The imperial army makes the Elector of Saxony prisoner in the battle of Mühlberg, and the Landgrave of Hesse surrenders. Henry VIII. of England and Francis I. die, and are succeeded by Edward VI. and Henry II. The work of the Reformation is carried on in England by Cranmer and Ridley, and in Scotland by Knox. Death of Cardinal Sadolet and of Vatable.

1548. The Augsburg *Interim*. The Leipsig Interim gives rise to the adiaphoristic controversy. St. Philip Neri founds the Order of the B. Trinity, which, later on, takes the name of the Oratory. *Consensus Tigurinus*, 1549. Osiandrian controversy at Koenigsberg, 1549-1566. Controversy between Amsdorf and George Major in 1551. Gruet is put to death at Geneva The Jesuits assume the direction of the theological studies at Ingolstadt in 1549. Labours of Peter Canisius in Austria in 1551.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1550-1555. Julius III., Pope. At the moment when several Protestant princes send their theologians and ambassadors to Trent, in 1551, Prince Maurice of Saxony, committing a double treason against the Emperor and his country, constrains the Council to disperse and the Emperor to conclude the Treaty of Passau, in 1552-1554. Assembly at Naumburg. Extraordinary concessions made by the Protestant theologians. Michael Servede is burned by the Swiss reformers in 1553, and a little later (1566) Gentilis is beheaded at Berne.

1555. Religious Peace of Augsburg: *Reservatum Ecclesiasticum.* Synergistic controversy between Pfeffinger and Amsdorf. Short pontificate of *Marcellus II.*

1555-1559. *Paul IV.*, Pope. Death of St. Ignatius Loyola, July 31, 1556. Thomas Cranmer is burned at the stake. Lainez elected General of the Society of Jesus. Abdication of Charles V. Philip II., King of all the Spanish dominions in 1556. Mary Tudor, the Catholic Queen, dies in 1558. She is succeeded by Elizabeth, who uniformly favours the Reformation.

1559-1565. Pius IV., Pope. Ferdinand I., Emperor, 1556-1564. The Jesuits establish themselves at Cologne in 1556; at Treves in 1561; at Mentz in 1562; at Augsburg and Dillingen in 1563; at Posen and other places in 1571. Death of Melanchthon, April 19, 1560.

1562-1563. The Council of Trent is again opened and completes its labours. In 1564, Pius IV. publishes the *Professio fidei Tridentina.* The year previous, Ursinus and Olivetanus published their Heidelberg Catechism. Convocation solemnly ratifies the Thirty-nine Articles at London in 1562. *Confessio Belgica*, 1562. *Corpus doctrinæ christianæ Saxonicum;* and later, *Philippicum*, 1560; *Prutenicum*; 1566.

1564-1576. Maximilian II., Emperor. *Pius V.*, Pope, 1566-1572. *Catechismus Romanus*, 1566; *Breviarium Romanum*, 1568. Attempts at reconciliation between the Catholics and Protestants, made by George Cassander, George Wizel, Fred. Staphylus, and Ad. Contzen. In 1567, Pius V. condemns seventy-six propositions extracted from the works of Baïus. Convention of the Polish Dissidents at Sandomir in 1570. Death of Calvin, May 27, 1564. Theodore Beza.

1572-1585. *Gregory XIII.*, Pope. St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572. Bull of Gregory XIII. against Baius, 1579. The Gregorian Calendar published in 1582. Gebhard the Elector, Archbishop of Cologne, is excommunicated, in 1583, in consequence of his criminal relations with Agnes of Mansfeld and his hostile designs against the Catholic Church. *Bellarmini disputationes de controversis christianæ fidei articulis*, Romæ, 1581-1592. Death of Maldonatus in 1583.

1577. Formula of Concord. The Socinian Catechism and Synod of Rakow, 1580. Faustus Socinus in Transylvania, 1578; in Poland, 1579.

1585-1590. *Sixtus V.*, Pope. He publishes a faulty edition of the Vulgate. *Martyrologium Romanum.* The Pope's decision in the Controversy on Grace among the Jesuits. L. Molina. *Cæsaris Baronii Annales* ecclesiastici. Death of Salmeron in 1585.

1590-1591. Urban VII., Gregory XIV., and Innocent IX., Popes. Death of the Elector, Christian I. New persecution of Crypto-Calvinism. Chancellor Crell.

1592. *Clement VIII.*, Pope. He publishes a thoroughly revised edition of the Vulgate, and reconciles Henry IV. of France to the Church, 1598. By the edict of Nantes, the Protestants obtain the free exercise of religion in all France. The *Congregatio de Auxiliis* meets to decide the question of Molinism. Sigismund III., King of Poland (1587-1632), inherits the crown of Sweden in 1592. His critical relations with Charles, Duke of Sudermanland. Death of Queen Elizabeth, 1603. James I. succeeds her. Controversy between Arminius and Gomar at Leyden, 1604.

1605-1621. *Paul V.*, Pope. The quarrel with Venice, commenced under Clement VIII. and Leo XI., continues during this pontificate. Venice is laid under interdict. Bellarmin and Sarpi continue their polemics. Controversy on the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. Catholic League formed in Germany under Maximilian of Bavaria, 1606. Peter de Berulle founds the French Oratory, 1611. Death of Estius, 1613. Congregation of St. Maur, 1618. Cyril Lucaris makes an effort to bring about an understanding between the Greek and Reformed Churches. Synod of Dordrect, 1618-1619.

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1618-1648. Thirty Years' War. Frederic V., Elector of the Palatinate, is defeated near Prague, November 8, 1621. Death of Bellarmin, 1620. Death of St. Francis of Sales, 1622.

1621-1623. Gregory XV., Pope. Establishment of the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.* Constitution regarding future papal elections. The Jesuit, Petau, teaches theology at the College of Paris; he dies in 1652.

1623-1644. *Urban VIII.*, Pope. He establishes a seminary for the propagation of the faith ("*Collegium Urbanum*"); publishes a new and amended edition of the Roman Breviary, 1643; and bestows privileges upon the Congregation of St. Maur. St. Vincent de Paul founds the Order of the Priests of the Mission ("Lazarists"), and Urban instructs him to draft a Rule for them. In conjunction with the widow Legras, he founds the Order of the Sisters of Charity in 1629. The "*Cautio Criminalis*" of the Jesuit, Spee, in 1631. Death of the Jesuit, Schall, in China, 1636. Victory of Tilly over the Danes and Lower Saxons, 1626, and of Wallenstein, 1628.

1629. *Restitution Edict* promulgated by the Emperor Ferdinand II., and re-establishment of the *status quo* as settled by the Treaty of Passau in 1552. Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, comes to Germany in 1630; his death at the battle of Lützen. Defeat of the Swedes at Noerdlingen by the imperial troops in 1634. Death of Cornelius á Lapide in 1637.

1640. Publication of the *Augustinus* by Jansenius, at first Professor of Louvain, and afterwards Bishop of Ypres. He dies in 1638. Urban issues against this work his bull *In Eminenti*, 1642. Hugo Grotius publishes his *Annotationes in Vet.* et *Nov. Testam.*, 1641. His death in 1645. Death of Bonfrère, 1643.

1644-1655. Innocent X., Pope. Ferdinand III., Emperor, 1637-1657. Louis XIV., King of France, 1643-1715. Petau publishes his *Theologica dogmata*, 1644. Arnauld, Nicole, Pascal, and others write in favour of Jansenism and against the Jesuits. The advocates of Jansenism called Jansenists and Gentlemen of Port-Royal, 1653. Innocent condemns the five propositions of Jansenius, 1645. *Colloquium caritativum* of Thorn, under the protection of Ladislaus IV.; between *Calixtus* and *Calovius*, on the one hand, and the Jesuit, Schoenhofer, on the other. The *Regula fidei* of Francis Véron, a work whose aim was to reconcile Catholics and Protestants. Paris Polyglot Bible, 1645.

1648. The Peace of Westphalia takes the year 1624 as the "*normal*" *year* of the religious situation and of the right of possession. The Pope, by his bull *Zelus domus Dei*, protests against the articles of the Treaty as injurious or prejudicial to the Catholic religion. Death of the Spaniard Calasanze, founder of the Piarists. Leo Allatius publishes his work, *De ecclesiæ occident. et orient. perpetua consensione.* Death of Descartes, 1650. Charles I., King of England from 1625, is made prisoner, and beheaded in 1649.

III. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE

COUNCILS HELD DURING THE SECOND AND THIRD PERIODS.

IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

Rheims, 1301. Rome, Paris, Pennafiel, 1302. Paris, 1303 (Assembly in the Louvre). Compiègne, 1304. Armenian Unionist Synod at Sis, 1307. Presburg, 1309. Paris, Salzburg, Treves, Cologne, and Mentz, 1310. London, Ravenna, and Bergamo, 1311. *Vienne* (*Fifteenth Œcumenical*), 1311-1312. London and Tarragona, 1312. Ravenna, Paris, and Saumur, 1314. Senlis, 1315. Nougarot and Magdeburg, 1315. Mentz, 1316. Tarragona, Ravenna, and Bologna, 1317. Sens, 1320. Magdeburg, Cologne, and Valladolid, 1322. Paris, Toledo, 1324. Avignon, Senlis, Alcala de Henarez, and Mariac, 1326. Ruffec, 1327. Compiègne, 1329. Tarragona and Benevento, 1331, 1332. Cologne, 1333 Paris, Rouen, 1334. Salamanca, 1335. Avignon, 1337. Treves, 1338. Aquileia, 1339. Freisingen, 1340. London and Armenian Synod, at Sis, 1342. Prague, 1343. Kalbe, in the territory of Magdeburg, and Spalato, in Dalmatia, 1344. Constantinople, 1351. Béziers, 1351. Cologne and Eichstädt, 1353, 1354. Canterbury, 1362. Lambeth, 1362. Angers, 1366. York, 1367. Lavaur, 1368. Salamanca, 1371. London, 1372. Valence, 1376. Prague, 1381. London, 1382. Salzburg, 1386. Capua, 1391. Paris, 1392. London, 1396. Paris, 1398.

IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

At London, 1401-1403, three Councils. Paris, 1404, 1405. Prague, 1405. Hamburg and Würzburg, 1407. Perpignan, 1408. Paris, 1408. Oxford, 1408. *Pisa*, 1409. Aquileja, 1409. Salamanca, 1410. Seville, 1412. Rome, 1413. London, 1413. *Constance* (*Sixteenth Œcumenical*), 1414-1418. Salzburg, 1418, 1420. Cologne and Treves, 1423. Pavia and Siena, 1423. Copenhagen, 1425. Paris, 1429. Tortosa, 1429. Riga, 1429. *Basle*, 1431-1439. Bourges, 1431, 1438 (diet). *Ferrara*, 1438. Frankfort, 1438. *Florence* (*Seventeenth Œcumenical*), 1439. Mentz, 1439. Freisingen, 1440. Rouen, 1445. Angers, 1446-1448. Lausanne, 1449. Constantinople, 1450. Mentz, Bamberg, and Salzburg, 1451. Cologne, 1452. Soissons, 1455. Avignon, 1457. Sens, 1459. Mentz, 1459. Constance and Eichstädt, 1463-1465. Toledo, 1473. Madrid, 1473. Aranda, 1473. Freisingen, Constance, and Breslau, 1475-1480. Tournay, Constance, Eichstädt, Bamberg, and Salzburg, 1481-1491. Sens, 1485. London, 1486. Camin, 1492. Treves, 1495. Ermeland and Breslau, 1497.

IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Camin, 1500. Meissen, 1504. Magdeburg, Bamberg, Breslau, and Petricow, 1505-1510. Tours, 1510. Pisa and Milan, 1511. *Lateran* (*Seventeenth Œcumenical*), 1512-1517. Florence, 1517. Paris, 1521. Rouen, 1522. Paris, 1528. Bourges, 1528. Montpellier, 1528. Cologne, 1536. *Trent* (*Nineteenth Œcumenical*), 1545-1563. Cologne, 1549. Poissy, 1554 (Assembly). Rheims, 1564. Toledo, 1565. Milan, 1565. Cambray, 1565. Milan, 1569 Malines, 1569. Milan, 1573, 1576, 1579. Rouen, 1581.

Milan. 1582 (being the sixth provincial council held by St. Charles Borromeo, besides eleven diocesan synods). Memphis, 1582. Rheims, 1583. Tours, 1583. Angers, 1583. Bordeaux, 1583. Bourges, 1583. Lima (in South America), 1583. Aix (in Provence), 1585. Mexico, 1585. Toulouse, 1590. Avignon, 1594. Aquileia, 1596.

IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

The ordinance of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV. de Reform., c. 2), that *provincial councils* should be held every three years and *diocesan synods* every year, was even more generally carried out. Of these numerous provincial councils the following deserve special mention, viz.: Petrikau, 1607. Paris, 1612. Florence, 1619, 1637, 1645, 1681, and 1691. Lucca, 1661, and 1681. Veletri, 1673. Naples, 1680. Malines, 1607. Narbonne, 1609. Bordeaux, 1624. Tyrnau, 1630. Constantinople, 1638, 1642, and 1672 (against Calvinist errors). At Lima, 1601, 1602, and 1603.

Alzog, J.B.
Manual of universal church history

BQX
81
.A5
v.3
c.2